ON THE

AUTHORIZED VERSION

OF THE

NEW TESTAMENT

IN CONNEXION WITH

111064

SOME RECENT PROPOSALS FOR ITS REVISION.

BY

RICHARD CHENEVIX TRENCH, D.D.
DEAN OF WESTMINSTER.

The Second Edition, revised and enlarged.

LONDON:
JOHN W. PARKER AND SON, WEST STRAND.
1859.

Digitized with financial assistance from the
Government of Maharashtra
on 02 July, 2018

CONTENTS.

CHAP.		PAGE
I.	INTRODUCTORY REMARKS	1
II.	ON THE NECESSARY INFERIORITY OF TRANSLATIONS TO THEIR ORIGINALS	11
III.	ON THE ENGLISH OF THE AUTHORIZED VERSION	32
IV.	ON SOME QUESTIONS OF TRANSLATION, AND THE ANSWERS TO THEM WHICH OUR TRANSLATORS GAVE	68
V.	ON SOME UNNECESSARY DISTINCTIONS INTRODUCED	83
VI.	ON SOME REAL DISTINCTIONS EFFACED	102
VII.	ON SOME BETTER RENDERINGS FORSAKEN, OR PLACED IN THE MARGIN	113
VIII.	ON SOME ERRORS OF GREEK GRAMMAR	132
IX.	ON SOME QUESTIONABLE RENDERINGS OF WORDS	154
X.	ON SOME INCORRECT RENDERINGS OF WORDS AND PASSAGES	169
XI.	ON SOME CHARGES UNJUSTLY BROUGHT AGAINST THE AUTHORIZED VERSION	188
XII.	ON THE BEST MEANS OF CARRYING OUT A REVISION	203
APPENDIX		216

00111064

LONDON:
PRINTED BY ROBSON, LEVEY, AND FRANKLYN,
Great New Street and Fetter Lane.

ERRATA.

p. 79, last line but one—"in *all* our modern editions"—too broad an assertion. Two have been pointed out to me, in which this is not the case.

„ 100, line 22, *for* 1 Cor. i. 8 *read* 1 Cor. i. 18.

„ 108, „ 24, „ Isai. liii. 12 „ Isai. liii. 11.

„ 110, „ 12, „ Prov. xix. 6 „ Prov. xix. 16.

„ 147, „ 3, „ Mark xvi. 2 „ John xx. 1.

„ 148, „ 22, „ Matt. xxxiii. 27 „ Matt. xxiii. 27.

„ 152, „ 15—"in *all* our modern Bibles"—too broad a statement, like that made p. 79. There are exceptions.

„ 160, line 18, *for* Col. ii. 5 *read* Col. ii. 15.

„ 165, „ 3, „ Ezek. xvi. 48 „ Ezek. xvi. 49.

„ 170, „ 8, „ Exod. xxv. 28 „ Exod. xxiii. 28.

„ ib. „ 24, „ Num. xxv. 9 „ Num. xxv. 7.

„ 174, „ 17, „ Acts xiv. 13 „ Acts xiv. 15.

ON THE

AUTHORIZED VERSION

OF THE

NEW TESTAMENT.

CHAPTER I.

INTRODUCTORY REMARKS.

IT is clear that the question, Are we, or are we not, to have a new translation of Scripture? or rather,—since few would propose this, who did not wish to lift anchor and loosen from its moorings the whole religious life of the English people,—Shall we, or shall we not, have a new revision of the Authorized Version? is one which is presenting itself more and more familiarly to the minds of men. This, indeed, is not by any means the first time that this question has been earnestly discussed; but that which distinguishes the present agitation of the matter from preceding ones is, that on all former occasions the subject was only debated among scholars and divines, and awoke no interest in circles beyond them. The present is apparently the first occasion on which it has taken serious hold of the popular mind. But now indications

of the interest which it is awakening reach us from every side. America is sending us the instalments—it must be owned not very encouraging ones—of a New Version, as fast as she can.[1] The wish for a revision has for a considerable time been working among Dissenters here; by the voice of one of these it has lately made itself heard in Parliament, and by the mouth of a Margaret Professor of Divinity in Convocation. Our Reviews, and not those only which are specially dedicated to religious subjects, begin to deal with the question of revision. There are, or a little while since there were, frequent letters in the newspapers, either urging such a step, or remonstrating against it;—few of them, it is true, of much value or weight; yet at the same time showing how many minds are now occupied with the subject.

---

[1] With more haste, it is to be feared, than good speed. It is certainly not very encouraging, in respect of the equipment of those who undertake the work, when in the American Bible Union's version of the Epistle to the Hebrews, published with an enormous apparatus of what present themselves as learned notes, we fall, in the fifth page, upon this note [on i. 9, "Thou hast loved righteousness, and hated iniquity"]: "ἠγάπησας . . καὶ ἐμίσησας. These *participles* are usually rendered by verbs." The translator congratulates himself that the *errata* are few. Running over a few of the notes I detected these: ἐστεφάνωσας, p. 9; ὁμοιότητα, p. 21; βοήθιαν, do.; πονεράς, pp. 14, 53; φοτισθέντες, p. 55; καταπόθησαν, p. 64; σπουδάσομεν (Heb. iv. 11), p. 19; πλανομένοις, p. 21; σωτερίας, p. 27; ἀντιλοχίας, p. 32; ἀκούμενοι, p. 73; διαθήκεν, p. 46; μεμαρτύρεται, p. 58; ἑρμενευόμενος, p. 30; εὐλόγεκε, p. 31; κατάπαυσε, p. 19; κατάσχομεν, p. 15;—all these, except perhaps one or two, testifying for themselves that they are not mere printer's *errata;* such I have omitted. The Ephesians yields a similar harvest: as χαιρῶν, χαιροῦ, p. 4; ἐκληρώθεμεν, ib.; εὐαγγαλίζω, p. 5; ἐνεργία, p. 6; μυστερίου, p. 3; Epiphanias, p. 4; συνεζωποίεσε, p. 7; ἐζοποίεσε, bis, p. 8; πρετοίμασεν, p. 9; πορόω, p. 19; ἐνέργησε, p. 6.

It is manifestly a question of such immense importance, the issues depending on a right solution of it are so vast and solemn, that it may well claim a temperate and wise discussion. Nothing is gained, on the one hand, by vague and general charges of inaccuracy brought against our Version; they require to be supported by detailed proofs. Nothing, on the other hand, is gained by charges and insinuations against those who urge a revision, as though they desired to undermine the foundations of the religious life and faith of England; were Socinians in disguise, or Papists—Socinians who hoped that, in another translation, the witness to the divinity of the Son and of the Spirit might prove less clear than in the present—Papists who desired that the authority of the English Scripture, the only Scripture accessible to the great body of the people, might be so shaken and rendered so doubtful, that men would be driven to their Church, and to its authority, as the only authority that remained. As little is the matter profited, or in any way brought nearer to a settlement, by sentimental appeals to the fact that this, which it is now proposed to alter, has been the Scripture of our childhood, in which we and so many generations before us first received the tidings of everlasting life. All this, well as it may deserve to be considered, yet, as argument at all deciding the question, will sooner or later have to be cleared away; and the facts of the case, apart from cries, and insinuations, and suggestions of evil motives, and appeals to the religious passions and prejudices of the day, apart, too, from feelings which in themselves demand the highest respect, will have to be dealt with in that spirit of seriousness and earnestness which a question affecting so profoundly the whole moral and spiritual life of the English people, not to speak of nations which are yet unborn, abundantly deserves.

It is no main and leading purpose in the pages which follow, either to advocate a revision, or to dissuade one; but rather I have proposed to myself to consider the actual worth of our present Translation; its strength, and also any weaknesses which may affect that strength; its beauty, and also the blemishes which impair that beauty in part; the grounds on which a new revision of it may be demanded; the inconveniences, difficulties, the dangers it may be, which would attend such a revision; some of the rules and principles according to which it would need, if undertaken at all, to be carried out; and thus, so far as this lies in my power, to assist others, who may not have been able to give special attention to this subject, to form a decision for themselves. I will not, in so doing, pretend that my own mind is entirely in equilibrium on the subject. On the whole, I am persuaded that a revision ought to come; I am convinced that it will come. Not, however, let us trust, as yet; for we are not as yet in any respect prepared for it; the Greek (I mean that special Hellenistic Greek here required), this, and the English no less, which would be needful to bring this work to a successful end, might, it is to be feared, be wanting alike. There is much of crude and immature in nearly all the contributions which have been, and for some time yet will be made, to this object. Nor, certainly, do I underrate the other difficulties which would beset such an enterprise; they look, some of them, the more serious to me the more I contemplate them. Still, believing that this mountain of difficulty will have to be surmounted, I can only trust and confidently hope that it, like so many other mountains, will not on nearer approach prove so formidable as at a distance it appears. Only let the Church, when the due time shall arrive, address herself to this work with earnest prayer for the Divine guidance, her conscience bear-

ing her witness that in no spirit of idle innovation, that only out of dear love to her Lord and his truth, and out of an allegiance to that truth which overbears every other consideration, with an earnest longing to present his Word, whereof she is the guardian, in all its sincerity to her children, she has undertaken this hard and most perilous task, and in some way or other every difficulty will be overcome. Whatever pains and anxieties the work may cost her, she will feel herself abundantly rewarded if only she is able to offer God's Word to her children, not indeed free from all marks of human infirmity clinging to its outward form,—for we shall have God's treasure in earthen vessels still,—but with some of these blemishes which she now knows of removed, and altogether approaching nearer to that which she desires to see it; namely, a work without spot or wrinkle, or any such thing; a perfect copy of an archetype that is perfect.

In the mean time, while the matter is still in suspense and debate, while it occupies, as it needs must, the anxious thoughts of many, it cannot misbecome those who have been specially led by their duties or their inclinations to a more close comparison of the English Version with the original Greek, to offer whatever they have to offer, be that little or much, for the helping of others towards a just and dispassionate judgment, and one founded upon evidence, in regard to the question at issue. And if they consider that a revision ought to come, or, whether desirable or not, that it will come, they must wish to throw in any contribution which they have to make toward the better accomplishing of this object. Assuming that they have any right to mingle in the controversy at all, they may reasonably hope, that even if much which they bring has long ago been brought forward by others, or must be set aside from

one cause or another, yet that something will remain, and will survive that rigorous proof to which every suggestion of change should be submitted. And in a matter of such high concernment as this the least is much. To have cast in even a mite into this treasury of the Lord, to have brought one smallest stone which it is permitted to build into the walls of his house, to have detected one smallest blemish that would not otherwise have been removed, to have made in any way whatever a single suggestion of lasting value toward the end here in view, is something for which to be for ever thankful. It is in that intention, with this hope, that I have ventured to publish these pages.

The work, indeed, which I thus undertake, cannot be regarded as a welcome one. There is often a sense of something ungenerous, if not actually unjust, in passing over large portions of our Version, where all is clear, correct, lucid, happy, awakening continual admiration by the rhythmic beauty of the periods, the instinctive art with which the style rises and falls with its subject, the skilful surmounting of difficulties the most real, the diligence and success with which almost all which was best in preceding translations has been in it retained and embodied; the constant solemnity and seriousness which, by some nameless skill, is made to rest upon all; in passing over all this and much more with a few general words of recognition, and then stopping short and urging some single blemish or inconsistency, and dwelling upon and seeming to make much of this, which often in itself is so little. For the flaws pointed out are frequently so small and so slight, that it might almost seem as if the objector had armed his eye with a microscope for the purpose of detecting that which otherwise would have escaped notice, and which, even if it were faulty, might well have been suffered to pass by,

unchallenged and lost sight of, in the general beauty of the whole. The work of Momus is never, or at least never ought to be, other than an ungracious one. Still less do we welcome the office of faultfinder, when that whose occasional petty flaws we are pointing out, has claims of special gratitude and reverence and affection from us. It seems at once an unthankfulness and almost an impiety to dwell on errors in that to which we for ourselves owe so much; to which the whole religious life of our native land owes so much; which has been the nurse and fosterer of our national piety for hundreds of years; which, associated with so much that is sad and joyful, sweet and solemn, in the heart of every one, appeals as much to our affections as to our reason.

But admitting all this, we may still reconcile ourselves to this task by such considerations as the following: and first, that a passing by of the very much which is excellent, with a dwelling on the very little which is otherwise, lies in the necessity of the task undertaken. What is good, what is perfect, may have, and ought to have, its goodness freely and thankfully acknowledged; but it offers comparatively little matter for observation. It is easy to exhaust the language of admiration, even when that admiration is intelligently and thoughtfully rendered. We are not tempted to pause till we meet with something which challenges dissent, nor can we avoid being mainly occupied with this.

And then, secondly, if it be urged that many of the objections made are small and trivial, it can only be replied, that nothing is really small or trivial, which has to do with the Word of God, which helps or hinders the exactest setting forth of that Word. That Word lends an importance and a dignity to every thing connected with it. The more

deeply we are persuaded of the inspiration of Holy Scripture, and of the extent of this inspiration, the more intolerant we shall be of any lets and hindrances to the arriving at a perfect understanding of that which the mouth of God has spoken. In setting forth his Word in another language from that in which it was first uttered, we may justly desire such an approximation to perfection as the instrument of language,—to which so much of imperfection cleaves,—will allow; and this not merely in greatest things, but in smallest.

Nor yet need the occasional shortcomings of our Translators be noted in any spirit of disrespect to them, or disparagement of their work. Some of the errors into which they fell were inevitable, and belonged in no proper sense to them more than to the whole age in which they lived, as for instance, in the matter of the Greek article. Unless we were to demand a miracle, and that their scholarship should have been altogether on a different level from that of their age, this could not have been otherwise. We may reasonably require of such a company of men, undertaking so great and solemn a work, that their knowledge should approve itself on a level with the very best which their age could supply; even as it does; but more than this it would be unfair and absurd to demand. If other of their mistakes might have been avoided, as is plain from the fact that predecessors or contemporaries did avoid them, and yet were not avoided by them, this only shows that the marks of human weakness and infirmity, which cleave to every work of men, cleave also to theirs. Nor will I refrain from adding, to preoccupy that charge of presumption, which is so ready at hand to cast in the face of any one who objects to any part of their work, that he who ventures to do this, does not in this presumptuously affirm him-

self a better scholar than they were. He for the most part only draws on the accumulated stores of the knowledge of Greek, which have been laboriously got together in the two hundred and fifty years that have elapsed since their work was done; he only claims to be an inheritor in some sort of the cares specially devoted to the elucidation of the meaning of Holy Scripture during this period. It would be little to the honour of those ages if they had made no advances in this knowledge; it would be little to the honour of our own, if we did not profit by their acquisitions. What our Translators said on this point concerning those who went before them, we, or those who come after us, may in turn say of them; and I cannot do better than quote here the very words in which they disclaimed for their work that it implied any disparagement of those, upon whose labours they rather were entering with praise to God, and with thankful gratitude to them: "We are so far off from condemning any of their labours that travailed before us in this kind, ... that we acknowledge them to have been raised up of God for the building and furnishing of his Church, and that they deserve to be had of us and of posterity in everlasting remembrance. . . . Blessed be they and most honoured be their name, that break the ice, and give the onset upon that which helpeth forward to the saving of souls. . . . . Yet for all that, as nothing is begun and perfected at the same time, and the later thoughts are thought to be the wiser; so if we, building upon their foundation that went before us, and being holpen by their labours, do endeavour to make that better which they left so good, no man, we are sure, hath cause to mislike us; they, we persuade ourselves, if they were alive, would thank us. . . . Of one and the same book of Aristotle's *Ethics* there are extant not so few as six or seven several translations.

Now if this cost may be bestowed upon the gourd, which affordeth us a little shade, and which to-day flourisheth, but to-morrow is cut down, what may we bestow, nay, what ought we not to bestow upon the Vine, the fruit whereof maketh glad the conscience of man, and the stem whereof abideth for ever? And this is the Word of God, which we translate."

CHAPTER II.

ON THE NECESSARY INFERIORITY OF TRANSLATIONS TO THEIR ORIGINALS.

IT is good and necessary that all who seek accurately to measure in a translation, what it yields and what it fails in yielding, should present clearly and distinctly to their own minds the fact, that in all translations there are losses unavoidable, as well as losses avoidable; that if, in emptying the precious wine from one vessel to another a careless hand may cause sometimes that to be spilt which might have been preserved, there is a further spilth which not the utmost care and skill could have prevented altogether. Avoidable losses, as has just been implied, are those which more pains, more watchfulness, a more complete mastery of the language out of which the translation is made, a more complete mastery of that into which it is made, enabling to call forth all its latent capacities, and, I will add, more genius, would have hindered from occurring; and it is for these alone that any translators can be held responsible. Unavoidable are those inherent in the nature of the task; in the relations of one language to another; in the lack of accurate correlations and correspondencies between them; in the very different schemes on which they are constructed; in what one might venture to call the innate stubbornness of the ὕλη out of which a new cosmos, the rival of that already existing, has to be evoked; the inferiority, if not throughout, yet in special points, of the translators' lan-

guage;—losses, therefore, which no labour, no skill, no genius, no mastery of one language or the other, no employment of all helps within reach, would have prevented. The translators may have done their part to the full; may have *turned*, and not *overturned*, their original (Jerome complains that in his time many *versiones* deserved to be called *eversiones* rather); they may have given the lie to the Italian proverb, "*Traduttori traditori*," or "Translators traitors,"—men, that is, who do not *render*, but *surrender*, their author's meaning;—their shortcomings may in weight and number be as few as it is possible to conceive, nay, let them be none at all, and yet the losses of which I speak will not have been therefore excluded.

It is not possible always to draw the exact line between these losses and the others. Thus a passage may have baffled the skill of one and of another adequately to give it back in a second tongue; it may seem as though the thing were not to be done; when another may arise, who, a greater master of language, or in a more genial hour, may untie or cut the knot which has baffled the skill of all who went before him, may take the impregnable fortress before which so many others have sat down in vain. It is to such translators, most few in number, that the magnificent encomium which Jerome gives to Hilary and his renderings from the Greek belongs,—"quasi captivos sensus in suam linguam victoris jure transposuit" (*Ep.* 33). We can seldom, therefore, absolutely affirm of any particular passage that its difficulties can never be completely overcome, though of many that they have never yet been overcome. Yet this must not prevent us from recognizing a large number of the shortcomings which attend all translation as ranging under this category,—to be regretted, therefore, but not to be imputed; seeing that, if any fault is to be found, it must

be found with language itself, which, marvellous gift of God as it is, yet working through men's limited faculties and powers, proves often so imperfect an implement; which, capable of so much, is yet not capable of all.

It needs hardly be observed, that in thus speaking of the mountains which will not become plains, I assume throughout that the work to be rendered *has* mountains; that it is grand in features, original in design; that the genius of its author travels more or less by unwonted paths, moves in an unwonted sphere, advances to the limits of human thought, and thus stretches to the utmost the capabilities of human speech. No one will deny that where thought, feeling, passion, imagination are absent, or are only slightly present, it will be quite possible to render from one language to another with little or no loss in the transfer; but the *Agamemnon*, the *Divina Commedia*, or the *Faust*,—what translator (unless he has entered upon his task with that utter unfitness for it which prevents him even from comprehending the greatness and the difficulties of it,) has not been staggered and amazed at the vastness, the variety, the infinite perplexity of the problems which are in these offered for his solution,—problems of which some will have to be evaded rather than solved, some to be solved imperfectly, and some not to be solved at all?

And if this be so with works of man's art and device, how much more certainly and how much more signally must it be the case, where the Book that is to be rendered is sole and unparalleled of its kind, reaching to far higher heights and far deeper depths than any other; having words of God, and not of man, for its substance; where the garment of man's speech *must* be narrower than the body of God's truth, which yet by one means or another has to be clothed with it; while the importance of doing

the best possible, with the far-reaching issues which will follow on success or failure, falls in each other case into absolute insignificance as compared with its importance here.

This imperfection, it may be replied, is an imperfection cleaving to all human languages alike; the original language must suffer from it no less than that into which the version is to be made. It cannot be doubted that this to a certain point is true. No doubt in whatever human tongue God may please to make his will to be known, his thoughts will transcend our speech. Wherever the sons of heaven are married to the daughters of earth, —Divine thoughts to human words,—the inequality of the union, the fact that, whatever richest blessings it may bring with it, it is still a marriage of disparagement, will make itself plainly to appear. We shall have his treasure, if I may repeat the image, in earthen vessels still. At the same time, one vessel may be of far finer, another of far coarser, earth. Thus, where a language for long centuries has been the organ and vehicle of Divine truth, there will be in it words which will have grown and expanded into some meetness for the task to which they have been put. Long set apart for sacred uses, for the designation of holy persons or things, there will float a certain sanctity round them. Life and death, good and evil, sin and repentance, heaven and hell, with all the mysteries of each, will have found utterances not wholly inadequate to them.

But how different will it be in a language now for the first time brought into the service of Divine truth. Here all will be by comparison slight and superficial, common and profane. For the most solemn, the most sacred, the augustest mysteries of our redemption, words will have to be employed which have little, if any thing, of solemn or

sacred or august about them,—words which have sometimes almost to be picked out of the mire,[1] in the hope that they may be cleansed, may little by little be filled with a higher sense, a holier meaning, than any which before their adoption into this sacred service they knew. And so no doubt they will at last; heathen 'Ostara' will become Christian 'Easter;' 'suona' and 'sunta' and 'sculd,' words touching once but the outer circumference of life in the old German heathendom, will severally as 'Sühne' and 'Sünde' and 'Schuld,' touch the centre and core of the Christian life of men. 'Hriuwa,' which meant so little, will become 'Reue,' which means so much; 'galauba,' 'Glaube;' not to speak of innumerable other words, to which the same or a yet more wonderful transfiguration will arrive.

We have examples new and old of the extreme perplexity, of which this which I have just mentioned will

[1] How often the missionary translator must make the experience which the Jesuits made in Japan long ago. One who has written the wonderful history of their labours there speaks thus: "Though the language be so copious, still it wants several proper words for expressing the mysteries of our religion, which makes the preachers of the Gospel very uneasy; for to use a word with an equivocal sense either turns the discourse into ridicule, or at least makes it unintelligible. As, for example, the word *jumogi*, a cross, signifies also a letter of the alphabet and the number ten; and therefore a preacher who makes use of this word to denote the Cross of Christ our Lord, leaves his auditory at a loss for his meaning. In like manner, if he would speak of a soul, they'll conclude he means the devil, the same word and character being common to both. To avoid, then, all equivocations, and give the infidels a more lively idea and higher veneration for our sacred mysteries, the Fathers of the Society thought fit to make use of the Portuguese words; and so they call God *Dios*, the soul *alma*, the cross *cruz*, the devil *demonio*." *History of the Church of Japan, written originally in French by Monsieur l'Abbé de T.* London, 1705; vol. i. p. 7; cf. p. 73.

continually be the cause. Thus the missionary translator, if he be at all aware of the awful implement which he is wielding, of the tremendous crisis in a people's spiritual life which has arrived when their language is first made the vehicle of revealed truths, will often tremble at the work he has in hand; tremble lest he should be permanently lowering or confusing the whole religious life of a people by choosing a meaner and letting go a nobler word for the setting forth of some leading truth of redemption; and yet the choice how difficult, the nobler itself falling how infinitely below his desires, and below the truth of which he would make it the bearer. Even those who are wholly ignorant of Chinese can yet perceive how vast the spiritual interests which are at stake in China; how much will be won or how much lost for the whole spiritual life of that people, it may be for ages to come, according as the right or the wrong word is selected by the translators of the Scriptures into Chinese for expressing the true and the living God.[2] As many of us as are ignorant of the language can be no judges in the controversy which on this matter is being carried on; but we can all feel how vital the question, how enormous the interests which are at stake; and not less, having heard the allegations on the one side and on the other, that there is only an alternative of difficulties here.

And even where the issues are not so vast and awful as in this case, how much may turn on having, or not having, the appropriate word. Two, or it may be more, will present themselves, each inadequate, yet each with its own advantages, so that it shall be exceedingly difficult for the most skilful master of language to determine which ought to be preferred. Thus it was not indifferent whether Λόγος

[2] See the Rev. S. C. Malan's *Who is God in China, Shin or Shang-te?*

in the prologue of St. John's Gospel, and in the other passages which would naturally be ruled by that passage, should be rendered in ecclesiastical Latin 'Sermo' or 'Verbum.' The fact that 'Verbum' has from the beginning been the predominant rendering, and that 'Verbum' is a neuter impersonal, possessing no such mysterious duplicity of meaning as Λόγος, which is at once 'the Word' and 'the Reason,' has, I do not hesitate to affirm, modified the whole development of Latin theology in respect of the personal "Word of God." I do not, indeed, believe that the advantages which in 'Verbum' are forgone, would have been secured by the choosing of 'Sermo' rather; any gains from this would have been accompanied by more than countervailing losses. I cannot, therefore, doubt that the Latin Church did wisely and well in preferring 'Verbum' to 'Sermo;' indeed, it ultimately quite disallowed the latter; but still the doubts and hesitation which existed for some time upon this point[3] illustrate well the difficulty of which I am speaking.

Or take another question, not altogether unlike this. Did the old 'pœnitentia,' or the 'resipiscentia' which some of the Reformers sought to introduce in its room, best represent μετάνοια? should μετανοεῖτε be rendered "pœnitentiam agite" or 'resipiscite'?[4] The Roman Catholics found great fault with Beza, that, instead of the 'pœnitentia,' hallowed by long ecclesiastical usage, and having acquired a certain prescriptive right by its long employment in the Vulgate, he, in his translation of Scripture, substituted 'resipiscentia.' Now Beza, and those who

[3] See Petavius, *De Trin.* vi. 1. 4.

[4] See Fred. Spanheim's *Dub. Evangelica*, pars 3ª, dub. vii.; Campbell, *On the Four Gospels*, vol. i. pp. 292 *sqq.*

stood with him in this controversy, were assuredly right in replying, that while a serious displeasure on the sinner's part at his past life is an important element in all true *μετάνοια* or repentance, still 'pœnitentia' is at fault, in that it brings out nothing but this, leaves the changed mind for the time to come, which is the central idea of the original word,[5] altogether unexpressed and untouched; that, moreover, 'resipiscentia' was no such novelty, Lactantius having already shown the way in a rendering with which now so much fault was found. Taking his ground strictly on etymology, Beza was perfectly justified; but it was also true, which he did not take account of, that *μετάνοια*, even before it had been assumed into scriptural usage,[6] and much more after, had acquired a superadded sense of regret for the past, or 'hadiwist' (had-I-wist), as our ancestors called it; which, if 'pœnitentia' seemed to embody too exclusively, his 'resipiscentia,' making at least as serious an omission, hardly embodied at all.[7] On the whole, I cannot but think that it would have been better to leave 'pœnitentia' undisturbed, while yet how much on either side there was here to be urged.

This, however, only by the way. The painful perplexity alluded to above, and felt so deeply by many a missionary translator at the present day, did not touch ours. Thanks

---

[5] Tertullian had noted this long before (*Adv. Marc.* ii. 24): "In Græco sermone pœnitentiæ nomen non ex delicti confessione sed *ex animi demutatione* compositum est."

[6] Plutarch (*Pericl.* c. 10): *Μετάνοια δεινὴ τοὺς Ἀθηναίους καὶ πόθος ἔσχε τοῦ Κιμῶνος.*

[7] A very recent translator of the New Testament in America seeks to make good for the English what Beza would have made good for the Latin; and for 'Repent' every where substitutes, "Change your minds," and for 'repentance,' "change of mind"!

to Gregory the Great, to the monk Augustine, to Alfred, to Wiclif, to Tyndale, and so many more; English was a language in which the wonderful works of God had been proclaimed so long, the language and the faith had so grown together, that those who in the latter days undertook this task of translating the Scriptures into English had not to complain of any strangeness in the one to the truths of the other, or of any profane, much less degrading, associations clinging to the words which they were obliged to use. Still the transcendant character of the Book to be rendered, being the Book of Him whose thoughts are not as our thoughts, must not be left out of sight when we seek to take a measure of what we may call the insuperable difficulties which attended the work they undertook.

But, setting aside this the unique character of the Bible, there are reasons enough why the translation of any considerable book must always in many points halt behind the original. These reasons are plain. In every language of highly-cultivated men,—probably, indeed, more than all in those two which God has willed shall contain the authentic records of his revelation of Himself to mankind,—there will be found subtleties, felicities, audacities, and other excellencies of speech, which are not capable of reproduction in any other. Each will have *idioms* in the strictest sense of the word,—turns of speech, that is, proper and peculiar to itself; and though other languages may have compensations more or fewer, which in like manner are theirs alone, still these, not being found there where exactly the translator wants them, are not likely to assist him much, or to redress the balance in his favour again.

One people will seize differences and distinctions, and embody them in words, which another has not cared, or, it may be, has not had the skill or the good fortune, to

make its own. Thus, the Greek will often have two words where we have but one. Hannibal is 'one-eyed' for us, and a Cyclops or Arimaspian is 'one-eyed;' but in the Greek he who is conceived to have by nature but a single eye is μονόφθαλμος; he who has only one, because the other has been lost, is ἑτερόφθαλμος. It is an indication of the Greek in its decline, when it ceased any longer to trouble itself with these fine but most real distinctions, that the Hellenistic has not cared to retain this distinction (see Matt. xviii. 9; Mark ix. 47). The more subtle-thoughted a people are, the finer and more numerous the differences will be which they will thus have apprehended, and to which they will have given permanence in words. For—to remain on our own immediate ground of the New Testament—what, we may ask, can an English translator do to express the distinction, oftentimes very significant, between ἀνήρ and ἄνθρωπος?—the honour which lies often in the first (Acts xiii. 16; xvii. 22), the slight which is intended to be conveyed in the second (Matt. xxvi. 72)? At this point the Latin, with 'vir' and 'homo,' is a match for the Greek, though we are not. In like manner, the differences, almost always instructive, occasionally important, between ἱερόν and ναός, βίος and ζωή, ἄλλος and ἕτερος, νέος and καινός, ἀληθής and ἀληθινός, φιλέω and ἀγαπάω, βόσκω and ποιμαίνω, mostly disappear, and, as it seems to me, there is no help but that they must disappear, in any English translation. Such facts remind us that language, divine gift to man as it is, yet working itself out through human faculties and powers, has cleaving to it a thousand marks of weakness and infirmity and limitation.

To take an example of this, the obliteration of distinctions, which is quite unavoidable, or which could only have

been avoided at the cost of greater losses in some other direction, and to deal with it somewhat more in detail,—the distinction between ᾅδης, the invisible underworld, the receptacle of all departed, and γέεννα, the place of torment, quite disappears in our Version. They are both translated 'hell,' ᾅδης being so rendered ten times, and γέεννα twelve; the only attempt to give ᾅδης a word of its own being at 1 Cor. xv. 55, where it is translated 'grave.' The confusion of which this is the occasion is serious; though how it could have been avoided, or how it would be possible now to get rid of it, I do not in the least perceive. It would not be possible to render ᾅδης, wherever it occurs, by 'grave,' thus leaving 'hell' as the rendering of γέεννα only; for see Matt. xi. 23; xvi. 18; the two first places of its occurrence, where this plainly would not suit. On the other hand, the popular sense links the name of 'hell' so closely with the place of torment, that it would not answer to keep 'hell' for ᾅδης, and to look out for some other rendering of γέεννα, to say nothing of the difficulty or impossibility of finding one; for certainly 'gehenna,' which I have seen proposed, would not do. The French have, indeed, adopted the word, though it is only 'gêne' to them; and Milton has once used it in poetry; but it cannot in any sense be said to be an English word. It is much to be regretted that 'hades' has never been thoroughly naturalized among us. The language wants the word, and in it the true solution of the difficulty might have been found.[8]

Then, too, it will continually happen that one language

On the "debasing limitation" which Christ's magnificent prerogative, καὶ ἔχω τὰς κλεῖς τοῦ θανάτου καὶ τοῦ ᾅδου (Rev. i. 18), endures, when it is rendered, "and have the keys of death and *of hell*," see some good observations in Howe's grand sermon, "The Redeemer's

will have words so elastic, so many-sided, so capable of being employed now in a good sense and now in a bad, in irony or in earnest, that other tongues can produce no equivalents for these. It is quite possible that they also, though transcended in some points, may themselves transcend in others; yet this will not help the translator. "In all languages whatever," to use Bentley's words, "a word of a moral or political signification, containing several complex ideas arbitrarily joined together, has seldom any correspondent word in any other language which extends to all these ideas."[9] But the remark is capable of far wider application, and we recognize here the source of one necessary imperfection in all translation. Looking at the work from an ideal point of view, it would be manifestly desirable to render constantly one word in one language by one and the same in another; having given to each its equivalent, to adhere to this throughout. But the rule, however theoretically good, is discovered, when the application of it is attempted, to be one which it is wholly impossible to carry out. If this has ever been proposed as an inflexible law, it must have been on the assumption that words in one language cover exactly the same spaces of meaning which other words do in another, that they have exactly the same many-sidedness, the same elasticity, the same power of being applied for good or for evil, for honour or for shame. But nothing is farther from the case. Words are enclosures from the great outfield of meanings; but different languages have enclosed on different schemes, as chance, or design, or the deeper instincts un-

---

dominion over the invisible world,"—*Works*, London, 1832, pp. 309, 310.

[9] *On Freethinking*, p. xxx.

consciously at work in men's minds, have determined; and words in different languages which are precisely co-extensive and commensurate with one another, are much rarer than we incuriously assume.

It is easy to illustrate this, the superior elasticity of a word in one language to that of one which is in part its equivalent in another. Thus, we have no word in English which at once means heavenly messengers and earthly, with only the context to determine which of the two is intended. There was no choice, therefore, but to render ἄγγελοι by 'messengers' at Luke vii. 24; ix. 52; Jam. ii. 25; however it might be translated 'angels' in each other passage of the New Testament where it occurs. Again, no word in English has the power which μάγος has in Greek, of being used at will in an honourable sense or a dishonourable. There was no help, therefore, but to render μάγοι by "wise men,"[10] or some such honourable designation, Matt. ii. 1; and μάγος by 'sorcerer,' Acts xiii. 6. Thus, again, it would have been difficult to represent Παράκλητος, applied now to the third Person of the Holy Trinity (John xiv. 16, 26), and now to the second (1 John i. 21), by any single word. 'Paraclete' would alone have been possible; and such uniformity of rendering, if indeed it could be called rendering at all, would have been dearly purchased by the loss of 'Comforter' and 'Advocate,'—both of them Latin words, it is true, but much nearer to the heart and understanding of Englishmen than the Greek 'Paraclete'

[10] Milton, indeed, speaks of these wise men as the "star-led *wizards*," and 'wizard' is the word which Sir John Cheke employs in his translation of St. Matthew; but the word is scarcely honourable enough for the μάγοι of this place, nor opprobrious enough for the μάγος of the Acts.

could ever have become.[11] To have rendered *δαιμόνια* 'devils,' and not 'gods,' at Acts xvii. 18, because it has been elsewhere so rendered, as Tyndale and Cranmer have done, would have been a confusing mistake. In the mouth of heathen men such as the Athenians who are speaking here, the word meant something quite different from what it meant elsewhere in the mouth of Jews, and demands to be differently rendered.

So, too, it would have been unadvisable to render *κύριε*, as the compellation of one person by another, always 'Sir,' or always 'Lord.' The word has a wider range than either of these two; it is only the two together which cover an equal extent. 'Sir' in many cases would not be respectful enough; 'Lord' in some would be too respectful (John xx. 15). Our Translators have prudently employed both; and in most cases have shown a fine tact in their selection of one or the other. One's only doubt is, whether, in the conversation of our Lord with the Samaritan woman (John iv.), they should not have changed the 'Sir,' which is perfectly in its place at ver. 11, where she is barely respectful to her unknown interrogator, into 'Lord' at ver. 15, or if not there, yet certainly at ver. 19. The Rheims version, beginning, as we do, with 'Sir,' already has exchanged this for 'Lord' at ver. 15; and thus delicately indicates the growing reverence of the woman for the mysterious stranger whom she has met beside Jacob's well.

---

[11] We should not forget, in measuring the fitness of 'Comforter,' that the fundamental idea of 'Comforter,' according to its etymology and its early use, is that of 'Strengthener,' and not 'Consoler;' even as the *παράκλητος* is one who, being summoned to the side of the accused or imperilled man (*advocatus*), stands by to aid and encourage. See the instructive note in Archdeacon Hare's *Mission of the Comforter*, pp. 521-527.

Or, again, a language will have words resting on and embodying some picturesque image, which, so far as they do this, have no counterparts elsewhere. If we met the Spanish 'pavonear' or the French 'pavaner,' we might render these by the English 'to strut;' there would, indeed, be hardly any choice but to do so; but where is the peacock (pavon) here? the strutting *as the peacock does*, which underlies and looks through the word which we thus inadequately render? We might render 'fourmiller' 'to swarm;' we could scarcely do otherwise; but where is the swarming *as the ants do*, the 'formiculare,' if one might so say, of the French original? So, too, our Translators may say, "*Be clothed* with humility" (1 Pet. v. 5);—and fitly; for no word in English would express *all* which ἐγκομβώσασθε does in Greek, namely, "Fasten humility upon you as a garment *which is tied with knots*,—not therefore to be lightly removed from you again." Still there is loss here.

Once more, one language will have words which utter in their own brief compass what it takes two or three, or, it may be, half a dozen words in another language to utter. The New Testament furnishes many such: as the εὐπερίστατος of Heb. xii. 1, not expressible, or at least not expressed by us, in less than six words, "which doth so easily beset us;" as the ἀλλοτριοεπίσκοπος of 1 Pet. iv. 15, which costs us only one word less—"busybody in other men's matters"—to render. I do not venture to affirm that in these particular cases such long circumlocutions were absolutely inevitable. One of the old Latin versions, which renders εὐπερίστατος ἁμαρτία, "*agile* peccatum," has at any rate, so far as the Latin goes, avoided this in the first instance; and then there is 'meddler' (though I am not prepared to recommend it), which would have done the same in the second. Still, even if these instances were in

one way or another got rid of from our Version, shown to be needless circumlocutions, it would not the less remain certain that any language, rich in expressive words, will frequently offer those which will need two, three, or it may be more, adequately to express in some other; though that other, it may be, elsewhere is as rich, or richer in the same kind. For example, when Montaigne says that women have "l'esprit *primesautier*," that they reach a right conclusion, if they reach it at all, *at the first bound*, what could we do in English with this 'primesautier'? and this impossibility of always matching one word by one must be accepted as another necessary imperfection in this work.

One language will give scope and opportunity for pregnant plays upon words, such as St. Paul delights in, for which others afford no answering opportunity; for it is only by a rare good fortune that the *paronomasia* of one language can be represented by that of another. I refer to such as the γινωσκομένη and ἀναγινωσκομένη of 2 Cor. iii. 2; the ἐργαζομένους and περιεργαζομένους of 2 Thess. iii. 11; and probably the ἔμαθε and ἔπαθε (παθήματα, μαθήματα) of Heb. v. 8. The loss, to be sure, on these occasions is not very serious; yet this cannot always be said. It cannot, for instance, at Ephes. iii. 14, 15: "For this cause I bow my knees unto the *Father* of our Lord Jesus Christ, of whom the whole *family* in heaven and earth is named." How profound a significance the words of the Apostle have, which we only imperfectly reproduce, and this because the word 'family' does not stand in etymological relation with 'father,' as πατριά does with πατήρ; while no other word can be proposed in its stead, capable of presenting in English the sublime play on words which exists in the Greek. To God the name 'Father' by highest right competes, and "every family" which subsists upon earth, subsists as

such by right of its relation to Him, and witnesses for this in the fact that the word πατριά (here our English breaks down), involves, and, indeed, is only the unfolding of, the word πατήρ. If πατριά were abstract, which some have attempted to prove, but quite failed in so doing, we might venture on 'fatherhood' instead of 'family;' which, indeed, would only be a going back to Wiclif's translation. He, finding 'paternitas' in the Vulgate,—I do not know how this came there, whether from a partial misunderstanding of πατριά, or from a praiseworthy determination to reproduce at all costs by aid of 'pater' and 'paternitas' the Greek *paronomasia*,—very fitly rendered it by 'fatherhood.' Πατριά, however, is not thus abstract, but concrete; and being so, help is not here to be found; nor, I believe, any where, except in that living interpretation, that *ministry* of the Word, which should set before it as a constant aim to redress whatever wrongs the readers of the Scripture not in its original tongues, may be in danger of suffering.

Again, our Translators say, "Now *I know* in part, but then *shall I know* even as also *I am known*" (1 Cor. xiii. 12); and we acquiesce in this; but reluctantly; for who can be quite content here to lose the very remarkable change from the simple γινώσκω to the composite and intenser ἐπιγνώσομαι, by which the Apostle expresses how much deeper, fuller, richer will be the knowledge of the world to come?—we acquiesce in it, because we have no verb connected with 'to know' which expresses this higher, more intimate knowledge and insight. 'Nosco' and 'pernoscam' would do it in the Latin; nothing that I see but 'know' and "perfectly know" in the English. Commenting on these words,—and it is only by commentary, not by translation, that their force can in English be brought

out,—one of our divines has well said, "Ἐπίγνωσις and γνῶσις differ. Ἐπίγνωσις is ἡ μετὰ τὴν πρώτην τοῦ πράγματος γνῶσιν παντελὴς κατὰ δύναμιν κατανόησις. It is bringing me better acquainted with a thing that I knew before, a more exact viewing of an object that I saw before afar off. That little portion of knowledge which we had here shall be much improved; our eye shall be raised to see the same things more strongly and clearly."[12]

Then, too, what one may call the audacities of a language, new and daring combinations of words, images so bold that no one ventures to reproduce them in another language,—such as, keeping clear of, do yet approach so close to the verge of extravagance, that tolerable, even sublime, in one language, they would be intolerable, perhaps ridiculous, in another,—these will add to the perplexities of a translator. The New Testament does not, indeed, offer any large number of these; but the Old how many. In Æschylus they must well nigh drive a translator to despair. But even in our Version of the New a more vigorous image has been sometimes changed under a real or presumed necessity for a weaker, or, it may be, the imaginative word let go altogether, and replaced by one strictly literal. Thus, we have shrunk from "the *lip* of the sea" (Heb. xi. 12), "the *mouths* of the sword" (Heb. xi. 34), and might with still better reason have done so from "the *calves* of the lips" (Hos. xiv. 2). One is, indeed, disposed to think that in this matter we have sometimes run before the need, and let go a strength that might have been perfectly well retained. Thus, why should σχιζομένους (Mark i. 10) be 'opened,' and not rather 'rent,' which is only suggested in the margin ('cleft' in the Geneva)? Or why should βασα-

[12] Culverwell, *Spiritual Opticks*, p. 180.

νιζόμενον. (Matt. xiv. 24) be merely 'tossed' (a very little sea will 'toss' a boat), and not rather 'tormented,' or some such word? Wiclif has the vigorous old word, 'shogged;' De Wette, 'geplagt.' Compare Mark vi. 48.

Other finer and more delicate turns of language must be suffered to escape. Thus our Translators make St. Luke to say that "all the Athenians and strangers spent their time[13] in nothing else but either to tell or to hear *some new thing*" (Acts xvii. 21): for, indeed, how could they express that exquisite *τι καινότερον* of the sacred historian? not "some *new* thing" only, but "something *newer than the last*,"—the *new* so soon growing old and stale that a *newer* was ever needed to tickle their languid and jaded curiosity.[14]

And lastly, it may be observed that what is perfectly clear in one language, through the wealth of inflections and other grammatical helps which it has, will lie open to misapprehension and misunderstanding in another, which has either now renounced, or has never been a possessor of, these. What English reader of 2 Pet. iii. 16, coming to the words, "*in which* are some things hard to be understood," does not refer "in which" to the 'epistles' of St. Paul, mentioned in the verse preceding, and see in these words a general statement of the hardness and obscurity of those writings? but no reader of the Greek could do this, or help seeing at once that "in which" referred to "these things" immediately going before, the things, namely, which St. Paul had spoken in his Epistles concerning the long-suffering of God, which *things* the unstable, as

---

[13] Better, I think, "spent their *leisure*" (*εὐκαίρουν*: 'vacabant' in the Vulgate); the word implying further that *all* their time was leisure, that "*vacation*," to use Fuller's pun, "was their whole *vocation*."

[14] Bengel: "*Nova* statim sordebant; *noviora* quærebantur."

St. Peter declares, might easily wrest to their harm. If our Lord declares that the woman who has found her lost piece of silver, "calleth her *friends* and her neighbours together" (Luke xv. 9), the Greek says that it is her *female* friends and neighbours; the English says—and, as English now is,[15] it can say—nothing of the kind. At Luke xviii. 16, one reading in the English might be in doubt to whom the earlier 'them' referred, to the 'disciples' or "the little children;" no doubt is possible in the Greek. There are, I dare say, some hundreds of such passages in the New Testament.

One word I will add, in conclusion, in regard of such inevitable losses as these, and those others which must also be considered as inevitable, in that, whatever men do, they will do it with a certain imperfection. We may say, looking at the matter from one point of view, that no book suffers so much from the accruing of these as the Bible; while, looking at it from another, none suffers so little. Both which assertions may be illustrated thus. It were a matter of more regret if a grain or two were rubbed off from a solid mass of gold in its transmission from hand to hand (for the loss would be greater), than if the same injury had befallen some lump of meaner ore; while yet, at the same time, no other could at all so well afford this detriment, which would not affect its value in any appreciable degree. It is even so with Holy Scripture. Its preciousness is such, that any the slightest wrong which may befall it cannot but be dearly grudged; every precaution must needs be taken to avert such wrongs, or to reduce them to a *mini-*

[15] I make this restriction; for if we had preserved 'friendess' and 'neighbouress,' both employed by Wiclif, though not in this place, our English might have said all which the Greek says.

mum: while yet the bulk and parcel of truth which is there is so vast, so far exceeding all measures of value which we know, that the very slight harm and loss which may thus come to pass, leaves it to all intents and purposes the same treasure, transcending all price, which before it was.

CHAPTER III.

ON THE ENGLISH OF THE AUTHORIZED VERSION.

THERE is a question, namely, What is the worth of the English in which our Translation is composed? which manifestly may be considered apart from another question, How far does this Translation adequately represent its original? and there are some advantages in keeping the two considerations separate. The English of our Version, which I propose in this way to consider apart, has been very often, and very justly, the subject of highest praise, or, indeed, the occasion of thankful gratulation to the Giver of every good gift, who has given such an excellent gift to us; and if I do not reiterate in words of my own or of others these praises and gratulations, it is only because they have been uttered so often and so fully, that it has become a sort of commonplace to repeat them. One fears to encounter the rebuke which befel the rhetorician of old, who, having made a long and elaborate oration in praise of the strength of Hercules, was asked, Who has denied it? at the close. Omitting, then, to praise in general terms what all must praise, it may yet be worth while to ask ourselves in what those singular merits of diction, which by the confession of all it possesses, mainly consist; nor shall I shrink from pointing out what appear to me its occasional weaknesses and blemishes, the spots upon the sun's disk, which impair its perfect beauty.

When, then, we seek to measure the value of any style, there are two points which claim our attention: first, the words themselves; and then, secondly, the words in their relations to one another, and as modified by these relations;—in brief, the dictionary and the grammar. These I propose to consider in their order; and first, the dictionary of our English Version. Now of this I will not hesitate in expressing my conviction that it is superior to the grammar. The first seems to me nearly as perfect as possible; there are more frequent flaws and faults in the second. In respect of words, we every where recognize in it that true *delectus verborum* on which Cicero[1] insists so earnestly, and in which so much of the charm of style consists. All the words used are of the noblest stamp, alike removed from vulgarity and pedantry; they are neither too familiar, nor, on the other side, not familiar enough; they never crawl on the ground, as little are they stilted and far-fetched. And then how happily mixed and tempered are the Anglo-Saxon and Latin vocables. No undue preponderance of the latter makes the language remote from the understanding of simple and unlearned men. Thus we do not find in our Version, as in the Rheims, whose authors might seem to have put off their loyalty to the English language with their loyalty to the English crown, 'odible' (Rom. i. 30), nor 'impudicity' (Gal. v. 19), nor 'longanimity' (2 Tim. iii. 10), nor 'coinquinations' (2 Pet. ii. 13, 20), nor 'comessations' (Gal. v. 21), nor 'postulations' (1 Tim. ii. 1), nor 'exinanite' (Phil. ii. 7), nor 'contristate' (Eph. iv. 30), nor 'zealatours' (Acts xxi. 20), nor 'agnition' (Philem. 6), nor 'suasible' (Jam. iii. 17), nor 'domesticals' (1 Tim. v. 8), nor 'repropi-

[1] *De Orat.* iii. 37.

tiate' (Heb. ii. 17).[2] Our Translators, indeed, set very distinctly before themselves the avoiding of 'inkhorn' terms. Speaking of their own Version, and comparing it with the Rhemish, published some thirty years before, they say, "We have shunned the obscurity of the Papists in the 'Azims,' 'tunicke,' 'rationall,' 'holocausts,' 'prepuce,' 'pasche' [they might have added 'scenopegia,' John vii. 2], and a number of such like, whereof their late translation is full, and that of purpose to darken the sense." It is not a little curious that three of the words thus found fault with, namely, 'tunic,' 'rational,' and 'holocaust,' have become thoroughly naturalized in the language.

And yet, while it is thus with the authors of our Version, there is no extravagant attempt on the other side to put under ban words of Latin or Greek derivation, where there are not, as very often there could not be, sufficient equivalents for them in the homelier portion of our language. Indeed, they now and then employ those Latin where these were close to their hand: witness 'celestial'

---

[2] Where the word itself which the Rheims translators employ is a perfectly good one, it is yet curious and instructive to observe how often they have drawn on the Latin portion of the language, where we have drawn on the Saxon; thus they use 'corporal' where we have 'bodily' (1 Tim. iv. 8), 'coadjutor' where we have 'fellow-worker' (Col. iv. 11; 'work-fellow' in the old versions was better still), 'incredulity' where we have 'unbelief' (Heb. iii. 19, and often), 'donary' where we have 'gift' (Luke xxi. 5), 'superedified' where we have 'built up' (1 Pet. ii. 5), 'precursor' where we have 'forerunner' (Heb. vi. 20), 'dominator' where we have 'Lord' (Jude 4), 'cogitation' where we have 'thought' (Luke ix. 46), 'fraternity' where we have 'brotherhood' (1 Pet. ii. 17); or they have the *more* Latin word where we the *less*, as 'obsecrations' where we have 'prayers' (Luke v. 33).

and 'terrestrial' (1 Cor. xv. 40), where it was free to them to employ 'heavenly' and 'earthly;' 'omnipotent,' of which they make such sublime employment at Rev. xix. 6, where 'almighty' would have equally served their turn, and would have been employed if their first thought had been always to find an Anglo-Saxon word. But there is no affectation upon their part of excluding those other, which in their measure and degree have as good a right to admission as the most Saxon vocable of them all; no attempt, like that of Sir John Cheke, who in his version of St. Matthew,—in many respects a valuable monument of English,—substituted 'hundreder' for 'centurion,' 'freshman' for 'proselyte,' 'gainbirth'—*i. e.* 'againbirth'—for 'regeneration,' with much else of the same kind. The fault, it must be owned, was in the right extreme, but was a fault and affectation no less. In regard of the rendering of one very notable word, I mean *ἀγάπη*, they have gone back, as is well known, in a large number of passages (the most remarkable is 1 Cor. xiii.), from the rendering of the earlier Anglican versions, and for the Saxon 'love' substituted the Latin 'charity,' and this, which is the more worthy of note, in the face of Tyndale's strong protest against any such rendering.[3]

One of the most effectual means by which our Translators have attained their rare felicity in diction, while it must diminish to a certain extent their claims to absolute originality, enhances in a far higher degree their good sense, moderation, and wisdom; justifies the character which in a certain proud humility they claim to themselves, as "men greater in other men's eyes than in their

[3] See his *Answer unto Sir Thomas More's Dialogue*,—*Works*, 1573, p. 253.

own, and that sought the truth rather than their own praise." I allude to the extent to which they have availed themselves of the work of those who went before them, and incorporated this work into their own, every where building, if possible, on the old foundations, and displacing nothing for the mere sake of change. On this point we may fitly quote their own words, as best revealing to us the aspect under which they contemplated the work which they had in hand: "Truly, good Christian reader, we never thought from the beginning that we should need to make a new translation, nor yet to make of a bad one a good one; . . . . but to make a good one a better, or out of many good ones one principal good one, not justly to be excepted against,—that hath been our endeavour, that our mark."

It has thus come to pass that our Version, like a costly mosaic, besides having its own felicities, is the inheritor of the successes in language of all the translations which went before. Tyndale's was singularly rich in these, which is the more remarkable, as his other writings do not surpass in beauty or charm of language the average merit of his cotemporaries; and though much of his work has been removed in the successive revisions which our Bible has undergone, very much of it still remains: the alterations are for the most part verbal, while the forms and moulds into which he cast the sentences have been to a wonderful extent retained by all who succeeded him. And not merely these, and the rhythm which is dependent upon these, are his, but even of his λέξις very much survives. To him we owe such phrases as "turned to flight the armies of the aliens,"[4] "the author and finisher of our

[4] It may be said that this is obvious; yet not so. The Rheims

faith;" to him, generally, we owe more than to any single labourer in this field—as, indeed, may be explained partly, though not wholly, from the fact that he was the first to thrust in his sickle into this harvest. So willing were King James's Translators to profit by all who went before them, that they did not decline to use what good the Rhemish Version occasionally, though rarely, offered. Thus the felicitous phrase, "the ministry of reconciliation" (2 Cor. v. 18), first appears in it; and the singularly happy rendering of βέβηλος by "profane person" (Heb. xii. 16); and were probably derived from it into our Version. Still, while they were thus indebted to those who went before them in the same sacred office, to Tyndale above all, for innumerable turns of successful translation, which they have not failed to adopt and to make their own, it must not be supposed that very many of these were not of their own introduction. A multitude of phrases which, even more than the rest of Scripture, have become, on account of their beauty and fitness, "household words" and fixed utterances of the religious life of the English people, we owe to them, and they first appear in the Version of 1611; such, for instance, as "the Captain of our salvation" (Heb. ii. 10), "the sin which doth so easily beset us" (Heb. xii. 1), "the Prince of life" (Acts iii. 15).

But in leaving, as I now propose to do, these generals, and entering on particulars, it is needful to make one preliminary observation. He who passes judgment on the English of our Version, he, above all, who finds fault with it, should be fairly acquainted with the English of that age in which this Version appeared. Else he may be very

---

does not get nearer to it than "turned away the camp of foreigners."

unjust to that which he is judging, and charge it with inexactness of rendering, where indeed it was perfectly exact according to the English of the time, and has only ceased to be so now through subsequent changes or modifications in the meaning of words. Few, I am persuaded, who have studied our Translation, and tried how far it will bear a strict comparison with the original which it undertakes to represent, but have at times been tempted to make hasty judgments here, and to pass sentences of condemnation, which they have afterwards, on better knowledge, seen reason to recall; and to confess their own presumption in making. Certainly, for myself, in many places where I once thought our Translators had been wanting in precision of rendering, I now perceive that, according to the English of their own day, their Version is exempt from the faintest shadow of blame. It is quite true that their rendering has become in a certain measure inexact for us, but this from circumstances quite beyond their control,—namely, through those mutations of language which never cease, and which cause words innumerable to drift imperceptibly away from those meanings which once they owned. In many cases, no doubt, our Authorized Version, by its recognized authority, by an influence silently working, but not the less profoundly felt, has kept words in their places, has given a fixity and stability of meaning to them which otherwise they would not have possessed; but the currents at work in language have been sometimes so strong as to overbear even this controlling power. The most notable examples of the kind which occur to me are the following:

Matt. vi. 25.—"*Take no thought* for your life, what ye shall eat, or what ye shall drink." This "Take no thought" is certainly an inadequate translation in our pre-

sent English of μὴ μεριμνᾶτε. The precept, as we read it now, seems to exclude and to condemn that just forward-looking care which belongs to man, and differences him from the beasts which live only in the present; and "most English critics have lamented the inadvertence of our Authorized Version, which in bidding us 'take no thought' for the necessaries of life, prescribes to us what is impracticable in itself, and would be a breach of Christian duty even were it possible."[5] But there is no 'inadvertence' here; nor, in this point at least, at Matt. x. 19. When our Translation was made, "Take no thought" was a perfectly correct rendering of μὴ μεριμνᾶτε. 'Thought' was then constantly used as equivalent to anxiety or solicitous care; as let witness this passage from Bacon:[6] "Harris, an alderman in London, was put in trouble, and died with *thought* and anxiety before his business came to an end;" or still better, this from one of the *Somers Tracts* (its date is of the reign of Elizabeth): "In five hundred years only two queens have died in childbirth. Queen Catherine Parr died rather *of thought.*"[7] A yet better example even than either of these is that occurring in Shakespeare's *Julius Cæsar*[8] ("*take thought*, and die for Cæsar"), where "to take thought" is to take a matter so seriously to heart that death ensues. A comparison of

---

[5] Scrivener, *Notes on the New Testament*, vol. i. p. 162; and cf. Alford, *in loco.*

[6] *History of Henry the Seventh.*

[7] Vol. i. p. 172.

[8] Act ii. sc. 1. *The Paston Letters* (vol. ii. p. 69, ed. 1840) supply another good example; and Golding's *Ovid*, b. x., another:

"Seven days he sat forlorn upon the bank, and never eat
A bit of bread. Care, tears and *thought*, and sorrow were his meat."

1 Sam. ix. 5 with x. 2, and of both with the original text, will make still more evident what force our Translators gave to the phrase, "take thought."

Luke xiii. 7.—"Why *cumbereth* it the ground?" 'Cumbereth' seems here too weak and too negative a rendering of *καταργεῖ*, a word implying active positive mischief; and so no doubt it is in the present acceptation of 'to cumber,' which means no more than "to burden." But it was not so always. 'To cumber' meant once to vex, annoy, injure, trouble; Spenser speaks of "*cumbrous* gnats." It follows that when Bishop Andrews quotes the present passage,[9] "Why *troubleth* it the ground?" (I do not know from whence he derived this 'troubleth,' which is not in any of our translations), and when Coverdale renders it, "Why *hindereth* it the ground?" they seem, but are not really, more accurate than our own Translators were. The employment by these last of 'cumber' at Luke x. 40, (the only other place in the Authorized Version where the word occurs) is itself decisive of the sense they ascribed to it. *Περιεσπᾶτο* (literally "was distracted") is there rendered by them, "was cumbered."[10]

Acts xvii. 23.—"As I pass by and beheld your *devo-*

---

[9] *Works*, vol. ii. p. 40.

[10] I have no doubt that most readers of that magnificent passage in *Julius Cæsar*, where Antony prophesies over the dead body of Cæsar the ills of which that murder shall be the cause, give to 'cumber' a wrong sense in the following lines:

"Domestic fury and fierce civil strife
Shall *cumber* all the parts of Italy."

They understand, shall *load* with corpses of the slain, or, as we say, 'encumber'—so at least I understood it long. A good, even a grand sense, but it is not Shakespeare's. He means,—shall trouble or mischief.

tions." This was a perfectly correct rendering of σεβάσματα at the time our Translation was made, although as much can scarcely be affirmed of it now. 'Devotions' is now abstract, and means the mental offerings of the devout worshipper; it was once concrete, and meant the outward objects to which these were rendered, as temples, altars, images, shrines, and the like; 'Heiligthümer' De Wette has very happily rendered it; cf. Bel and Drag. 27; and 2 Thess. ii. 4, the only other passage in New Testament where the word occurs, and where we have rendered πάντα λεγόμενον Θεὸν ἢ σέβασμα, "all that is called God or *that is worshipped.*" It is such,—not the 'devotions' of the Athenians worshipping, but the objects which the Athenians devoutly worshipped,—which St. Paul affirms that he 'beheld,' or, as it would be better, "accurately considered" (ἀναθεωρῶν). Yet the following passage in Sidney's *Arcadia* will bear out our Translators, and justify their use of 'devotions,' as accurate in their time, though no longer accurate in ours: "Dametas began to look big, to march up and down, swearing by no mean *devotions* that the walls should not keep the coward from him."[11]

Acts xix. 37.—"Ye have brought hither these men, who are neither *robbers of churches* (ἱεροσύλους), nor blasphemers of your goddess." I long counted this "robbers of *churches*," if not positively incorrect, yet a slovenly and indefensible transfer of Christian language to heathen objects; that "robbers *of temples*," or some such phrase,

[11] I have not removed this paragraph in this second edition; but the fact which I had not, but ought to have, noted, namely, that our Translators give as a marginal reading, "gods that you worship, 2 Thess. ii. 4," leaves it, on the whole, more probable that they employed 'devotions,' not in this objective, but in its modern subjective sense, in which case the rendering is not to be defended.

should rather have stood here. But there is no incorrectness in the phrase, as judged by the language of that day. 'Church' is in constant use in early English for heathen and Jewish temples as well as for Christian places of worship. I might quote a large array of proofs; I suppose Golding's *Ovid* would yield fifty examples of this use. Two, however, will suffice. In the first, which is from Holland's *Pliny*,[12] the term is applied to a heathen temple: "This is that Latona which you see in the *Church* of Concordia in Rome;" while in the second, from Sir John Cheke's translation of St. Matthew, it is a name given to the temple at Jerusalem: "And lo the veil of the *Church* was torn into two parts from the top downwards" (Matt. xxvii. 51).[13]

Acts xxi. 15.—"After three days we *took up our carriages* and went up to Jerusalem." A critic of the early part of this century makes himself merry with these words, and their inaccurate rendering of the original: "It is not probable that the Cilician tent-maker was either so rich or so lazy." And a more modern objector to the truthfulness of the Acts asks, How could they have taken up their carriages, when there is no road for wheels, nothing but a mountain track, between Cæsarea and Jerusalem? But 'carriage' is a constant word in the English of the sixteenth and seventeenth century[14] for baggage, being that which men carry, and not, as now, that which carries

---

[12] Vol. ii. p. 502.

[13] Again, in Marlowe's *Translation of the First Book of Lucan:*

"These troops should soon pull down the *Church* of Jove."

[14] "Spartacus charged his [Lentulus'] lieutenants, that led the army, overthrew them, and took all their *carriage*" [*τὴν ἀποσκευὴν ἅπασαν*]. North's *Plutarch's Lives*, p. 470.

them. Nor can there be any doubt that it is employed by our Translators here, as also in one or two other passages where it occurs, in this sense (Judg. xviii. 21; 1 Sam. xvii. 22); and while so understood, the words "took up our carriages" are a very sufficient rendering of the ἐπισκευασάμενοι of the original. The Geneva has it correctly, though somewhat quaintly, "we trussed up our fardels."

1 Cor. iv. 4.—"I know nothing *by* myself." This hardly conveys any distinct meaning to the English reader, or, if it suggests any, it is a wrong one. In his οὐδὲν ἐμαυτῷ σύνοιδα the Apostle would say, "I know nothing *of* myself," in other words, "*against* myself;"—"I have, so far as I can see into my own heart and life, a conscience void of offence." Examples of 'by' thus used with the power of our modern 'against' are not common even in our early literature, but from time to time occur. Thus, in Foxe's *Book of Martyrs*, an Inquisitor to a poor woman whom he is examining, "Thou hast spoken evil words *by* the queen;" and she answers, "No man living upon earth can prove any such things *by* me."[15]

Ephes. iv. 3.—"*Endeavouring* to keep the unity of the Spirit in the bond of peace." Passages like this, in which the verb 'endeavour' occurs, will sometimes seem to have been carelessly and loosely translated, when, indeed, they were rendered with perfect accuracy according to the English of that day. "Endeavour," it has been well said, "once denoted all possible tension, the highest energy that could be directed to an object. With us it means the last feeble hopeless attempt of a person who knows that he cannot accomplish his aim, but makes a conscience of going through some formalities for the pur-

[15] *Examination of Elizabeth Young by Martin Hussie.*

pose of showing that the failure is not his fault."[16] More than one passage suffers from this change in the force of 'endeavour,' as 2 Pet. i. 15, and this from the Ephesians still more. If we attach to 'endeavour' its present meaning, we may too easily persuade ourselves that the Apostle does no more than bid us to attempt to preserve this unity, and that he quite recognizes the possibility of our being defeated in the attempt. He does no such thing; he assumes success. Σπουδάζοντες means "giving all diligence," and 'endeavouring' meant no less two centuries and a half ago.

1 Tim. v. 4.—"If any widow have children or *nephews*." But why, it has been asked, are ἔκγονα translated 'nephews' here, and not 'grandchildren' or 'descendants'? and why should 'nephews' be specially charged with this duty of supporting their relatives? The answer is, that 'nephews' (='nepotes') was the constant word for grandchildren and other lineal descendants; as witness the following passages; this from Hooker: "With what intent they [the apocryphal books] were first published, those words of the *nephew* of Jesus do plainly signify, 'After that my *grandfather* Jesus had given himself to the reading of the Law and of the Prophets, he purposed also to write something pertaining to learning and wisdom;'"[17] and this from Holland: "The warts, black moles, spots, and freckles of fathers, not appearing at all upon their own children's skin, begin afterwards to put forth and show themselves in their *nephews*, to wit, the children of their sons and daughters."[18] There is no doubt that 'nephews'

[16] *Lincoln's-Inn Sermons*, by F. D. Maurice, p. 156.

[17] *Ecclesiastical Polity*, b. v. c. xx.

[18] *Plutarch's Morals*, p. 555.

is so used here, as also at Judges xii. 14. Yet it has misled a scholar so accurate as the late Professor Blunt, who, writing of the apostolic times, urges that in them the duties of piety extended so far, that not children only, but 'nephews' were expected to support their aged relations.[19]

1 Pet. ii. 4, 5.—"To whom coming, as unto a living stone, ... ye also as *lively* stones are built up." Many probably before now have wondered and regretted that λίθον ζῶντα being translated "a *living* stone," λίθοι ζῶντες, which follows immediately after, should be no more than "*lively* stones;" 'living,' as applied to Christ, being thus brought down to 'lively,' as applied to Christians, with no corresponding reduction in the original to warrant it. Now I think it certainly is to be regretted that our Translators did not retain one and the same word, namely, 'living,' in both places, seeing that they found one and the same in their original. Still, for all this, it must not be forgotten that 'lively' was far more nearly equipollent to 'living' once than now it is, even if it was not so altogether. Examples in proof are given below.[20]

I cannot but think that, in case of a revision, words like these, which have imperceptibly shifted their position since our Translation was made, should be exchanged for others now occupying the place which they occupied

---

[19] *Church of the First Three Centuries*, p. 27.

[20] "Had I but seen thy picture in this plight,
It would have madded me. What shall I do,
Now I behold thy *lively* body so?"
Titus Andronicus, Act iii. sc. 1.

"That his dear father might interment have,
See, the young man entered a *lively* grave."
Massinger, *The Fatal Dowry*, Act ii. sc. 1.

once. Such words, current intellectual money still, but whose value is different now from what once it was, are more perilous, more likely to deceive than words wholly obsolete. The last are like rocks which stand out from the sea; we are warned of their presence, and there is little danger of our making shipwreck upon them. But words like those just cited, as familiar now as they ever have been, but employed in quite different meanings from those which they once possessed, are hidden rocks, which give no notice of their presence, and on which we may be shipwrecked, if I may so say, without so much as being aware of it. It would be manifestly desirable that these unnoticed obstacles to our seizing the exact sense of Scripture,—obstacles which no carelessness of our Translators, but which Time in its onward course, has placed in our way,—should be removed. "Res fugiunt, vocabula manent,"—this is the eternal law of *things* in their relation to *words*, and it renders necessary at certain intervals a readjustment of the two.

Let me too observe, that in thus changing that which by the silent changes of time has become liable to mislead, we should only be working in the spirit, and according to the manifest intention, which in their time guided the Translators of 1611. They evidently contemplated as part of their task the removing from *their* revision of such words as in the lapse of years had become to their cotemporaries unintelligible or misleading. For instance, 'to depart' no longer meant to separate; and just as at a later day, in 1661, "till death us *depart*" was changed in the Marriage Service for that which now stands there, "till death us *do part*," so in their revision 'separate' was substituted for 'depart' ("*depart* us from the love of God") at Rom. viii. 39. 'To allow' hardly meant any longer 'to

praise' (allaudare), 'to have pleasure in;' it was not therefore suffered to remain as the rendering of *εὐδοκεῖν*, Heb. xii. 8; though, with a certain inconsistency, it was left at Luke xi. 48, as the rendering of *συνευδοκεῖν*: 'consent,' which the Rheims has, is perhaps a little too weak, yet preferable there.

At Matt. xxiii. 25, we have another example of the same. The words stood there up to the time of the Geneva version, "Ye make clean the outer side of the cup and of the platter; but within they are full of *bribery* and excess." 'Bribery,' however, about their time was losing, or had lost, its meaning of rapine or extortion, and was therefore no longer a fit rendering of *ἁρπαγή*; the 'bribour' or 'briber' was not equivalent to the robber: they therefore did wisely and well in exchanging 'bribery' for 'extortion' here. They dealt in the same spirit with 'noisome' at 1 Tim. vi. 9. In the earlier versions of the English Church, and up to their revision, it stood, "They that will be rich fall into temptation and snares, and into many foolish and *noisome* (*βλαβερὰς*) lusts." 'Noisome,' that is, when those translations were made, was simply equivalent to noxious or hurtful;[21] but in the beginning of the seventeenth century it was acquiring a new meaning, the same which it now retains,—namely, that of exciting disgust rather than that of doing actual hurt or harm. Thus a tiger would have been 'noisome' in old English; a skunk or a polecat would be 'noisome' in modern. Here was reason enough for the change which they made.

Indeed, our only complaint against them in this matter

[21] "He [the superstitious person] is persuaded that they be gods indeed, but such as be *noisome*, hurtful, and doing mischief unto men." Holland, *Plutarch's Morals*, p. 260.

is, that they did not carry out this side of their revision consistently and to the full. Thus they have suffered the very word last mentioned, 'noisome' I mean, to remain in some other passages, from which it should no less have disappeared. Three or four of these occur in the Old Testament, as Job xxxi. 40; Ps. xci. 3; Ezek. xiv. 21; only one in the New, Rev. xvi. 2; where κακὸν ἕλκος is certainly not "a *noisome* sore" in our sense of 'noisome,' that is, offensive or disgusting, but an 'evil,' or, as the Rheims has it, "a *cruel* sore." It is the same with "by and bye." This, when they wrote, was ceasing to mean 'immediately.' The inveterate procrastination of men had caused it to designate a remoter term; even as 'presently' does not any longer mean "at this present," but "in a little while;" and "to *intend* any thing" is not now "earnestly to do," but "to purpose doing it." They did well, therefore, that in many cases, as at Mark ii. 12, they did not leave 'by and bye' as a rendering of εὐθέως and εὐθύς. They would have done still better if they had removed it in every case, and not suffered it in four places (Matt. xiii. 21; Mark vi. 25; Luke xvii. 7; xxi. 9) to remain.

Again, 'to grudge' was ceasing in their time to have the sense of "to murmur openly," and was already signifying "to repine inwardly;" a 'grudge' was no longer an open utterance of discontent and displeasure at the dealings of another,[22] but a secret resentment thereupon entertained. It was only proper, therefore, that they should replace 'to grudge' by 'to murmur,' and a 'grudge' by a 'murmuring,' in such passages as Mark xiv. 5; Acts vi. 1. On two oc-

[22] "Yea, without *grudging* Christ suffered the cruel Jews to crown Him with most sharp thorns, and to strike Him with a reed." *Examination of William Thorpe*, in Foxe's *Book of Martyrs*.

casions, however, they have suffered 'grudge' to stand, where it no longer conveys to us with accuracy the meaning of the original, and even in their time must have failed to do so. These are 1 Pet. iv. 9, where they render ἄνευ γογγυσμῶν, "without grudging," and Jam. v. 9, where μὴ στενάζετε is rendered, "Grudge not."[23] These renderings were inherited from their predecessors, but their retention was an oversight.

In another instance our Translators have failed to carry out to the full the substitution of a more appropriate phrase for one, which indeed, unlike those others, could have been at no time worthy of praise, or any thing else than more or less misleading. They plainly felt that 'Easter,' which had designated first a heathen, and then a Christian, festival, was not happily used to set forth a Jewish feast, even though that might occupy the same place in the Jewish calendar which Easter occupied in the Christian; and they therefore removed 'Easter' from places out of number where in the earlier versions it had stood as the rendering of *Πάσχα*, substituting 'passover' in its room. With all this, they have suffered 'Easter' in a single instance,—at Acts xii. 4, "intending after *Easter* to bring him forth to the people,"—to remain; sometimes, I am sure, to the perplexity of the English reader. 'Jewry,' in like manner, which has been replaced by 'Judæa' almost every where else, has yet been allowed,

---

[23] As an evidence of the perplexity which 'grudge,' used as it is here, was calculated to create, see Manton's *Commentary on St. James, in loco*, 1651, p. 549, who is "unwilling to recede from our own translation," but is unable to accept 'Grudge not,' to which he gives its modern sense, as a fair rendering of μὴ στενάζετε,—which indeed, so regarded, it is not.

I must needs believe by the same oversight, twice to continue (Luke xxiii. 5; John vii. 1).

Thus much in regard of obsolete *uses* of words not in themselves obsolete; but the way of dealing with words actually themselves obsolete is not by any means so clear. It does not, indeed, seem difficult to lay down a rule here; the difficulties mainly attend its application. The rule seems to me to be this,—Where words have become perfectly unintelligible to the great body of those for whom the translation is made, the ἰδιῶται of the Church, they ought clearly to be exchanged for others; for the Bible works not as a charm, but as reaching the heart and conscience through the intelligent faculties of its hearers and readers. Thus is it with 'taches,' 'ouches,' 'knops,' 'neesings,' 'mufflers,' 'wimples,' 'habergeon,' 'brigandine,' 'bolled,' 'ear' (*arare*), 'daysman,' in the Old Testament, words dark even to scholars, where their scholarship is rather in Latin and Greek than in early English. Of these, however, there is hardly one in the New Testament. There is, indeed, in it no inconsiderable amount of archaism, but of a quite different character; words which, while they are felt by our people to be old and unusual, are yet, if I do not deceive myself, perfectly understood by them, by wise and simple, educated and uneducated alike. These, shedding round the sacred volume the reverence of age, removing it from the ignoble associations which will often cleave to the language of the day, should on no account be touched, but rather thankfully acknowledged and carefully preserved. "The dignity resulting from archaisms,"[24] in Bishop Horsley's

[24] *Biblical Criticism*, vol. iii. p. 301.

words, "is not to be too readily given up." For, indeed, it is good that the phraseology of Scripture should not be exactly that of our common life; that it should be removed from the vulgarities, and even the familiarities, of this; just as there is a sense of fitness which dictates that the architecture of a church should be different from that of a house.

It might seem superfluous to urge this; yet it is far from so being. It is well nigh incredible what words it has been sometimes proposed to dismiss from our Version, on the ground that they "are now almost or entirely obsolete." Symonds thinks "clean escaped" (2 Pet. ii. 18) "a very low expression;" and, on the plea of obsoleteness, Wemyss proposed to get rid of 'straightway,' 'haply,' 'twain,' 'athirst,' 'wax,' 'lack,' 'ensample,' 'jeopardy,' 'garner,' 'passion,' with a multitude of other words not a whit more aloof from our ordinary use. Purver, whose *New and Literal Translation of the Old and New Testament* appeared in 1764, has an enormous list of expressions that are "clownish, barbarous, base, hard, technical, misapplied, or new coined;" and among these are 'beguile,' 'boisterous,' 'lineage,' 'perseverance,' 'potentate,' 'remit,' 'seducers,' 'shorn,' 'swerved,' 'vigilant,' 'unloose,' 'unction,' 'vocation.' For each of these (many hundreds in number) he proposes to substitute some other.

And the same worship of the fleeting present, of the transient fashions of the hour in language, with the same contempt of that stable past which in all likelihood will be the enduring future, long after these fashions have past away and are forgotten, manifests itself to an extravagant degree in the version of the American Bible Union. It needs but for a word to have the slightest suspicion of age upon it, to have ceased, it may be only for the moment,

to be the current money of the street and the market-place, and there is nothing for it but peremptory exclusion. 'Chasten' and 'chastening,' 'to better,' 'to faint,' 'to quicken,' 'conversation,' 'saints,' 'wherefore,' 'straitly,' 'wroth,' with hundreds more, are thrust out, avowedly upon this plea; and modern substitutes introduced in their room. I can fancy no more effectual scheme for debasing the Version, nor, if it were admitted as the law of revision, for the lasting impoverishment of the English tongue. One can only compare this course with a custom of the Fiji islanders, who, as soon as their relations begin to show signs of age, put them out of the way. They, however, have at least this to say for themselves, that these old would grow older, more helpless, more burdensome, every day. It is nothing of the kind with the words which, on something of a similar plea, are forcibly dismissed. A multitude of these, often the most precious ones, after a period of semi-obsoleteness, of withdrawal from active service for a while, obtain a second youth, pass into free and unquestioned currency again. In proof of this, we need only to refer to such a document as Speght's *Glossary* of "old and obscure words" in Chaucer, of date 1667.[25] A very large proportion of these are not 'old' and not 'obscure,' have not the faintest shadow of obsoleteness clinging to them, at the present. But nothing would so effectually hinder this rejuvenescence, this *palingenesy* of words, as the putting a ban upon them directly they pass out of vulgar use; as this resolution, that if they have withdrawn for ever so brief a time from the every-day service of men, they shall never be permitted

[25] See some more proofs of the same in my *English Past and Present*, fourth edition, p. 80.

to return to it again. A true lover of his native tongue will adopt another course.

"Obscurata diu populo bonus eruet;"

and words which are in danger of disappearing, instead of bidding them begone, he will do his best to win back and to detain.

This retaining of the old diction in all places where a higher interest, that, namely, of being understood by all, did not imperatively require the substitution of another phrase, would be most needful, not merely for the reverence which attaches to it, and for the avoiding every unnecessary disturbance in the minds of the people, but for the shunning of another danger, which ought not lightly to be hazarded. Were the substitution of new for old carried out to any large extent, this most injurious consequence would follow, namely, that our Translation would be no longer of a piece, not any more one web and woof, but in part English of the seventeenth century, in part English of the nineteenth. Now, granting that English of the nineteenth century is as good as English of the seventeenth, of which there may be very reasonable doubts, still they are not the same; the differences between them are considerable. Some of these differences we can explain, others we must be content only to feel. But even those who could not explain any part of them would yet be conscious of them, would be pained in such a work by a sense of incongruity, of new patches on an old garment, and of those failing to agree with this.[26] Now all will

[26] The same objection would attend the introduction of words in themselves old, but employed in modern senses, such as were quite foreign to them when our Version was made. For instance, the American Bible Union substitutes 'reflexion' for 'discretion,' as a

admit that it is of vast importance that the Bible of the nation should be a book capable of being read with delight —I mean quite apart from its higher claim as God's Word to be read with devoutest reverence and honour. It can be so now. But the sense of pleasure and satisfaction in it, I mean merely as the foremost English classic, would be greatly impaired by any alterations which seriously affected the homogeneousness of its style. And this, it must be remembered, is a danger altogether new, one which did not at all beset the former revisions. From Tyndale's first edition of his New Testament in 1526 to the Authorized Version there elapsed in all but eighty-five years, and this period was broken up into four or five briefer portions by Cranmer's, Coverdale's, the Geneva, the Bishops' Bible, which were published in the interval between one date and the other. But from the date of King James's Translation (1611) to the present day nearly two hundred and fifty years have elapsed: and more than this time, it cannot be doubted, will have elapsed before any steps are actually taken in this matter. When we argue for the facilities of revision now from the facilities of revision on previous occasions, we must not forget that the

---

rendering of מְזִמָּה Prov. ii. 11. But 'reflexion' was not used to designate a *mental* operation till towards the end of the seventeenth century. It belongs to the Lockian period of mental philosophy, not to the Baconian; if, indeed, Locke himself was not the first to employ 'reflexion' in this sense. Webster, in like manner, substitutes 'expire' for "give up the ghost;" but 'expire,' in this sense at least, belongs also to the latter half, not to the former, of the same century. He substitutes 'plunder' for 'spoil,'—a worse error; for 'to plunder,' as is familiar to most, was a word unknown to the language, till it was brought here, just about the beginning of our Civil Wars, by some who had served under Gustavus Adolphus in Germany.

long interval of time which has elapsed since our last review of the English text, so very much longer than lay between any of the preceding, has in many ways immensely complicated the problem, has made many precautions necessary now, which would have been superfluous then.[27]

Certainly, too, when we read what manner of stuff is offered to us in exchange for the language of our Authorized Version, we learn to prize it more highly than ever. Indeed, we hardly know the immeasurable worth of its religious diction till we set this side by side with what oftentimes is proffered in its room. Thus, not to speak of some suggested changes which would be positively offensive, we should scarcely be gainers in perspicuity or accuracy, if for Jam. i. 8, which now stands, "A double-minded man

---

[27] It is an eminent merit in the *Revision of the Authorized Version by Five Clergymen*, of which the Gospel of St. John and the Epistle to the Romans have already appeared, that they have not merely urged by precept, but shown by proof, that it is possible to revise our Version, and at the same time to preserve unimpaired the character of the English in which it is composed. Nor is it only on this account that we may accept this work as by far the most hopeful contribution which we have yet had to the solution of a great and difficult problem; but also as showing that where reverent hands touch that building, which some would have wholly pulled down that it might be wholly built up again, these find only the need of here and there replacing a stone which had been incautiously built into the wall, or which, trustworthy material once, has now yielded to the lapse and injury of time, while they leave the building itself in its main features and framework untouched. Differing as the Revisers occasionally do even among themselves, they will not wonder that others sometimes differ from the conclusions at which they have arrived; but there can, I think, be no difference upon this point, namely, that their work deserves the most grateful recognition of the Church.

is unstable in all his ways," we were to read, "A man unsteady in his opinions is unconstant in all his actions" (Wemyss). Our gains would not be greater, if "Count it all joy when ye fall into divers temptations" (Jam. i. 2), were replaced, as Turnbull, one of our latest workers in this field, would have it, by the following: "Keep yourselves perfectly cheerful, when you are exposed to a variety of trials." So, too, the first clause of Col. ii. 22 may not be very satisfactory as it now stands; yet who would recognize, "injunctions which are all detrimental by their improper use," which is Turnbull's again, as indeed an improved translation? Neither would the advantage be very evident, if "I have a baptism to be baptized with" (Luke xii. 50) gave place to "I have an immersion to undergo." "Wrath to come" we may well be contented to retain, though we are offered "impending vengeance" in its place. "Shall cut him asunder" is certainly a more vigorous, not to say a more accurate, rendering of διχοτομήσει than "will punish him with the utmost severity" (Matt. xxiv. 51). There is not so great plainness of speech in "the deadness of Sarah's womb," that it needs to be exchanged for "Sarah's incapacity for childbearing" (Rom. iv. 20).[28] "In chambering and wantonness" would not be improved on, even though we were to substitute for it, "in unchaste

[28] I thought at first that it was the mere love of slip-slop in the place of genuine English, which had induced this change; but when, turning to another page of Mr. Sawyer's new Version (Boston, 1858), from which this and the last specimen are drawn, I met, "Can he become an unborn infant of his mother a second time?" substituted for, "Can he enter the second time into his mother's womb?" (John iii. 4), I at once recognized that it was that exaggerated sense of propriety, so rife in America, which we more justly count impropriety, that dictated both these alterations.

and immodest gratifications." Dr. Campbell's work, "*On the Four Gospels*," contains dissertations which have their value; yet the profit would be small of superseding Mark vi. 19, 20, as it now stands, by the following: "This roused Herodias' resentment, who would have killed John; but could not, because Herod respected him, and, knowing him to be a just and holy man, protected him, and did many things recommended by him, and heard him with pleasure." Of Harwood's *Liberal Translation of the New Testament* (London, 1768), and the follies of it, not very far from blasphemous, it is unnecessary to give any specimens.

When we consider not the words of our Version one by one, but the words in combination, as they are linked to one another, and by their position influence and modify one another; in short, the accidence and the syntax, this, being good, is yet not so good as the selection of the words themselves. There are undoubtedly inaccuracies and negligences here. Bishop Lowth long ago pointed out several faults in the grammatical construction of sentences;[29] and although it must be confessed that now and then he is hypercritical, and that his objections will not stand, yet others which he has not pressed would be found to supply the place of those which must therefore be withdrawn.

But here too, and before entering on this matter, there is room for the same observation which was made in respect of the *words* of our Translation. Many charges have here also been lightly and ignorantly, some presumptuously, made. Our Translators now and then appear ungrammatical, because they give us, as they needs must, the

[29] In his *Short Introduction to English Grammar*.

grammar of their own day, and not the grammar of ours.[30] It is curious to find Bishop Newcome[31] taking them to task for using 'his' or 'her,' where they ought to have used 'its;' as in passages like the following: "But if the salt have lost *his* savour, wherewith shall *it* be salted?". (Matt. v. 13.) "Charity doth not behave *itself* unseemly, seeketh not *her* own" (1 Cor. xiii. 5; cf. Rev. xxii. 2). "This sometimes," he complains, "introduces strange confusion." But this 'confusion,' as he calls it, "this inaccuracy in grammar," as Webster has styled it, was indeed no confusion, no inaccuracy at all. When our Translators wrote, it was inevitable, or at least could only be avoided by circumlocutions, as by the use of 'thereof;' nor, moreover, did this usage present itself as any confounding of masculine and neuter, or of personal and impersonal, at the time when our Version was made; for then that very serviceable, but often very inharmonious, little

---

[30] The French Academy, in the Preface to the new *Dictionnaire Historique de la Langue Française*, has some excellent remarks in respect of acts of similar injustice which often are committed, p. xv. "Ces écrivains y seront quelquefois défendus contre d'indiscrètes critiques, qui leur ont reproché comme des fautes de langage ce qui n'était que l'emploi légitime de la langue de leur temps. A chaque époque s'établissent des habitudes, des conventions, des règles même, auxquelles n'ont pu assurément se conformer par avance les écrivains des époques antérieures, et qu'il n'est ni juste ni raisonnable de leur opposer, comme s'il s'agissait de ces premiers principes dont l'autorité est absolue et universelle. C'est pourtant en vertu de cette jurisprudence rétroactive qu'ont été condamnées, chez d'excellents auteurs, des manières de parler alors admises, et auxquelles un long abandon n'a pas toujours enlevé ce qu'elles avaient de grâce et de vivacité."

[31] *Historical View of the English Biblical Translations*, Dublin, 1792, p. 289.

word, 'its,' as a genitive of 'it,' had not appeared, or had only just appeared, timidly and rarely, in the language,[32] and 'his' was quite as much a neuter as a masculine.

Others have in other points found fault with the grammar of our Version, where, in like manner, they "have condemned the guiltless," their objections frequently serving only to reveal their own unacquaintance with the history and past evolution of their native tongue—an unacquaintance excusable enough in others, yet hardly in those who set themselves up as critics and judges in so serious and solemn a matter as is here brought into judgment. This ignorance is indeed sometimes surprising. Thus

---

[32] I have elsewhere entered on this matter somewhat more fully (*English Past and Present*, 4th ed. pp. 128 *sqq.*), and have there observed that 'its' nowhere occurs in our Authorized Version. Lev. xxv. 5 ("of *its* own accord"), which had been urged as invalidating my assertion, does not so really; for reference to the first, or indeed to any of the early editions will show that in them the passage stood "of *it* own accord." Nor is 'it' here a misprint for 'its;' for we have exactly the same "by *it* own accord" in the Geneva Version, Acts xii. 10; and in other English books of the beginning of the seventeenth century, which never employ 'its.' Thus in Rogers's *Naaman the Syrian*, published in 1642, but the lectures delivered some eight years earlier: "I am at this mark, to withdraw the soul from the life of *it* own hand," *Preface*, p. i.; and again: "The power of the Spirit is such that it blows at *it* own pleasure," p. 441; and once more: "The scope which mercy proposes to herself in the turning of the soul to God, even the glory of *it* own self," p. 442. There are a few examples of 'its' in Shakespeare, but several of 'it,' as it were gradually preparing the other's way. Thus in *The Winter's Tale*, Act iii. sc. 2: "The innocent milk in *it* most innocent mouth;" and again, *King John*, Act ii. sc. 1: "Go to *it* grandame, child." There is a full treatment of this word, with notices of the first appearance of it, in Mr. Craik's very valuable work, *On the English of Shakespeare*, p. 91.

Wemyss[33] complains of a false concord at Rev. xviii. 17: "For in one hour so great *riches is* come to nought." He did not know that 'riches' is properly no plural at all, and the final 's' in it no sign of a plural, but belonging to the word in its French form, 'richesse,' and that 'riches' has only become a plural, as 'alms' and 'eaves' are becoming, and 'peas' has become, such, through a general forgetfulness of this fact. When Wiclif wants a plural, he adds another 's,' and writes 'richessis' (Rom. ii. 4; Jam. v. 2). At the same time it is undoubtedly true that when our Version was made, 'riches' was already commonly regarded and dealt with as a plural; in this Version itself it is generally so used,[34] and therefore it would have been better for consistency's sake if they had made no exception here; but there is no grammatical error in the case, any more than when Shakespeare writes, "The *riches* of the ship *is* come to shore." The same objector finds fault with "asked *an alms*" (Acts iii. 3), and suggests "asked *some alms*" in its room, evidently on the same assumption that 'alms' is plural. Neither can he tolerate our rendering of 1 Tim. v. 23: "Use a little wine for thine *often* infirmities;" but complains of 'often,' an adverb, here used as though it were an adjective; while, indeed, the adjectival use of 'oft,' 'often,' surviving still in "*oft*times," "*often*times," is the primary, the adverbial merely secondary.

But all frivolous, ungrounded objections set aside, there will still remain a certain number of passages where the

---

[33] *Biblical Gleanings*, p. 212.

[34] But not always; for at Jer. xlviii. 36 it stood in the early editions, "The *riches* that he hath gotten *is* perished." In such modern editions as I have consulted, 'is' has been tacitly changed into 'are.'

grammatical construction is capable of improvement. In general the very smallest alteration will set every thing right. These are some:—

Heb. v. 8.—"Though He *were* a Son, yet learned He obedience by the things which He suffered." If the Apostle had been putting a possible hypothetical case, this would be correct; for example, "*Though He slay* me, yet will I trust in Him" (Job xiii. 15), is without fault. But here, on the contrary, he is assuming a certain conceded fact, that Christ *was* a Son, and that being such, and though He *was* such, yet in this way of suffering He learned obedience. 'Though' is here a concessive conditional particle, the Latin 'etsi' or 'etiamsi' as followed by an indicative, and should have itself been followed by such in our Version. It ought to be, "Though He *was* a Son, &c."

John ix. 31.—"If any man be a worshipper of God, and *doeth* his will, him He heareth." As in the passage just noted, we have a subjunctive instead of an indicative, an actual objective fact dealt with as though it were only a possible subjective conception, so here we have just the converse, an indicative instead of a subjunctive. It is true that in modern English the subjunctive is so rapidly disappearing, that "If any man *doeth* his will" might very well pass. Still it was an error when our Translators wrote; and there is, at any rate, an inconcinnity in allowing the indicative 'doeth,' in the second clause of the sentence, to follow the subjunctive 'be' in the first, both equally depending upon 'if:' one would gladly, therefore, see a return to "*do* his will," which stood in Tyndale's version.

1 John v. 15.—"And if we know that He *hear* us, whatsoever we ask, we know that we have the petitions that we desired of Him." In this sentence the two

verbs 'know' and 'hear' are not *both* dependent on 'if,' but only the former; 'hear,' therefore, inherited from Tyndale, is incorrect, and the correction of the Geneva version should have been admitted: "And if we know that He *heareth* us, &c."

Matt. xvi. 15.—"*Whom* say ye that I am?" The English is faulty here. It ought plainly to be, "*Who* say ye that I am:" as is evident if only 'who' be put last: "Ye say that I am *who?*" The Latin idiom, "*Quem* me esse dicitis?" probably led our Translators, and all who went before them, astray. Yet the cases are not in the least parallel. If the English idiom had allowed the question to assume this shape, "*Whom* say ye me to be?" then the Latin form would have been a true parallel, and also a safe guide; the accusative '*whom*,' not, indeed, as governed by 'say,' but as correlative to the accusative '*me*,' being then the only correct case, as the nominative 'who,' to answer to the nominative 'I,' is the only correct one in the passage as it now stands. The mistake repeats itself on several occasions; thus at Matt. xvi. 13; Mark viii. 27, 29; Luke ix. 18, 20; Acts xiii. 25.

Heb. ix. 5.—"And over it the *Cherubims* of glory." But 'Cherubim' being already plural, it is excess of expression to add another, an English plural, to the Hebrew, which our Translators on this one occasion of the word's occurrence in the New Testament, and always in the Old, have done. Their choice was between 'Cherubim' or 'Cherubs.' In this latter case they would have dealt with 'Cherub' as a naturalized English word, forming an English plural. There would have been nothing to object to this; just as there would be nothing to object to 'automatons' or 'terminuses,' which ultimately, no doubt, will be the plurals of 'automaton' and 'terminus;' as 'dogmas' and not 'dog-

mata' (Hammond) is now the plural of 'dogma;' while there would be much to object to 'automatas' or 'terminies,' or to 'erratas,' though, strangely enough, we find this in Jeremy Taylor, as we do 'synonymas' in Mede. It might be free to use either 'geniuses' or 'genii' as the plural of 'genius' (we do in fact employ both, though, like the Latin 'loci' and 'loca,' in different senses), but not 'geniies;' and it is exactly this sort of error into which our Translators have here fallen.

Phil. ii. 3.—"Let *each* esteem other better than *themselves*." Compare with this Rev. xx. 13: "They were judged, *every man* according to *their* works." The same exception must be taken against both passages. 'Each' and 'every,' though alike implying many, alike resolve that many into its units, and refer to it in these its constituent parts, with only the difference that 'each' segregates, and 'every' aggregates, the units which compose it.

Rev. xxi. 12.—"And *had* a wall great and high." The verb 'had' is here without a nominative. All that is necessary is to return to Wiclif's translation: "And *it* had a wall great and high."

Again, we much regret the frequent use of adjectives ending in 'ly' as though they were adverbs. This termination, being that of so great a number of our adverbs, easily lends itself to the mistake, and at the same time often serves to conceal it. Thus, our Translators at 1 Cor. xiii. 5, say of charity, that it "doth not behave itself *unseemly*." Now this, at first hearing, does not sound to many as an error, because the final 'ly' of the adjective 'unseemly' causes it to pass with them as though it were an adverb; but substitute another equivalent adjective,—say, "doth not behave itself *improper*," or "doth not behave itself *unbefitting*,"—and the violation

of the laws of grammar makes itself felt at once. Compare Tit. ii. 12: "soberly, righteously, and *godly* in this present world." It ought to be 'godlily' here, as 'unseemlily' in the other passage; or if this repetition of the final 'ly' is unpleasing to the ear, as indeed it is, then some other word should be sought. The error, which, it must be owned, can plead some of the greatest names in English literature in its support, recurs in 2 Tim. iii. 12; Jude 15; and is not unfrequent in the Prayer Book. Thus, we find it in the thirty-sixth Article: "We decree all such to be rightly, *orderly*, and lawfully consecrated."[35]

Should a revision of our Version ever be attempted, it seems to me that the same principle should rule in dealing with archaic forms as I have sought to lay down in respect of archaic words. Nothing but necessity should provoke alteration; thus, there can be no question but that our old English præterites, 'clave,' 'drave,' 'sware,'

---

[35] It is curious to note how frequent are the errors arising from the same cause. Thus I remember meeting in Foxe's *Book of Martyrs* (I have not the exact reference) the words, "if this be *perpend*." Here it is clear that Foxe was for the moment deceived by the termination of 'perpend,' so like the usual termination of the past participle; and did not observe that he ought to have written, "if this be *perpended*." How often we hear of the "*Diocletian* persecution:" the English is here as faulty as if we were to speak of the "*Decius* persecution;" so too of the "*Novatian* schism." In each case the final 'an' deceives. In our own day Tennyson treats 'eaves' as if the final 's' were the sign of the plural, which being dismissed, one might have 'eave' for a singular; and he writes "the cottage *eave*;" but 'eaves' ('efese' in the Anglo-Saxon) is itself the singular. With the same momentary inadvertence Lord Macaulay deals with the final 's' in 'Cyclops' as though it were the plural sign, and speaks in one of the late volumes of his history of a 'Cyclop;' and pages might be filled with mistakes which have their origin in similar causes.

'tare,' 'brake,' 'spake,' 'strake,' and I think also 'lift,' should stand. They are as good English now as they were two centuries and a half ago: in many cases they are the forms still in use among our common people, if not in towns, yet in the country; and even where they are not, they create no perplexity in the minds of any, but serve profitably to difference the language of Scripture from the language of common and every-day life. It is otherwise, as it seems to me, with archaisms which are in positive opposition to the present usage of the English tongue. Thus, 'his' and 'her' should be replaced by 'its,' at such passages as Matt. v. 13; Mark ix. 50; Luke xiv. 34; Rev. xxii. 2; 1 Cor. xiii. 5; which might be done almost without exciting the least observation; so also 'which' by 'who,' wherever a person, and not a thing, is referred to. This, too, might be easily done; for our Translators have no certain law here: for instance, in the last chapter of the Romans, 'which' occurs seven times, referring to a person or persons, 'who' exactly as often. The only temptation to retain this use of 'which' would be to mark by its aid the distinction between ὅστις and ὅς, so hard to seize in English. At the same time, a retention with this view would itself involve many changes, seeing that our Translators did *not* turn 'which' to this special service, but for ὅς and ὅστις employed 'who' and 'which' quite promiscuously.

Before leaving this part of the subject, it may be well to observe, that a large amount of tacit unacknowledged revision of our Version has found place at different times, leading to the removal of many antiquated forms; out of which it results that a copy of the Authorized Bible at the present day differs in many details from the same as it first was issued by the king's printer, though professing

to be absolutely identical with it. It would be hypercritical to object to all which has been in this way done, though one hardly sees by what right the changes, however desirable, were made. The following alterations, which have come under my eye, may be noticed. 'Moe,' which stood in several places in the exemplar edition (at John iv. 41; Gal. iv. 27), has been replaced by 'more;' 'fet,' the old perfect of 'fetch,' is now printed 'fetched' (Acts xxviii. 13); 'lift,' where it stands as a perfect, has been altered to 'lifted' (Luke xi. 27; Acts ix. 41), yet not uniformly, for in more than one place 'lift' has been allowed to stand (Luke xvi. 23). 'Kinred,' the older form of the word, has every where been changed into 'kindred;' and 'flix,' this too the older form,[36] has in like manner yielded to 'flux' (Acts xxviii. 8). 'Apollo' stood in several places instead of 'Apollos,' which in like manner has been removed (1 Cor. iii. 22; iv. 6); 'ought,' as the perfect of 'owe,' has been changed into 'owed' (Matt. xviii. 24, 28; Luke vii. 41); the stately 'Hierusalem' has every where been changed to 'Jerusalem.' Less to be justified than any of these is the change of 'broided,' another form of 'braided,' into 'broidered' (1 Tim. ii. 9); while least excusable of all is the change of 'shame*fast*ness,' in the same verse, into 'shame*faced*ness,' another and later word growing out of the corruption of the earlier. 'Shamefastness' is formed upon 'shamefast,' that is, 'fast,' or established, in honourable 'shame;' just as 'steadfastness' on 'steadfast,' 'soothfastness' on 'soothfast,' 'rootfastness,' a good old word now let go, on 'rootfast.' To change this into 'shame*faced*ness' is to allow

[36] See Holland, *Pliny's Natural History*, vol. ii. pp. 37, 39, 40, and often.

all the meaning and force of the word to run to the surface, to leave it ethically a far inferior word,—and marks an unfaithful guardianship of the text, both on their part who first introduced, and theirs who have so long allowed, the change.

CHAPTER IV.

ON SOME QUESTIONS OF TRANSLATION, AND THE ANSWERS TO THEM WHICH OUR TRANSLATORS GAVE.

I HAVE already touched in the second chapter, devoted exclusively to this subject, on various graver difficulties which lie in the path of the translator, some of which it is only given him at the best partially to overcome; others of which will wholly overcome him. But besides these harder questions, not to be solved, or to be solved only in part, there are others, themselves also oftentimes hard enough, which will offer themselves for his solution,—which will meet him, so to speak, on the very threshold of his work. I propose in this chapter a little to consider what sort of answer our own Translators have given to some of these questions, as they presented themselves to them. It need scarcely be observed, that wherever they acquiesced in and adopted the answers which their predecessors had given, they did by this course make these their own; and we have a right to regard them as responsible for such.

Let us take, first, a question which in all translation is constantly recurring—this, namely: In what manner ought technical words of the one language, which have no exact equivalents in the other, which indeed cannot have, because the exact thing itself is not there, to be rendered; measures, for instance, of wet and dry, as the

βάτος and κόρος of Luke xvi. 6, 7; the μετρητής of John ii. 6; coins, such as the δίδραχμον of Matt. xvii. 24; the στατήρ of Matt. xvii. 27; the δραχμή of Luke xv. 8; titles of honour and authority which have long since passed away, and to which, at best, only remote resemblances now exist, as the γραμματεύς and νεωκόρος of Acts xix. 35; the Ἀσιάρχαι of the same chapter, ver. 31; the ἀνθύπατος of Acts xiii. 7?

The ways in which such words may be dealt with reduce themselves to four, and our Translators, by turns, have recourse to them all. The first, which is only possible when the etymology of the word shines clearly and transparently through it, is to seize this, and to set against the one word another, either adopted or newly coined, which shall utter over again in the language of the translation what the original word uttered in its own. It is thus, for instance, with Cicero's 'indolentia,' which he invented and set over against the ἀπάθεια of the Stoics; his 'veriloquium,' as against the Greek ἐτυμολογία. This course was chosen when our Translators rendered Ἄρειος πάγος, "Mars-hill" (Acts xvii. 22), τετράδιον, 'quaternion' (Acts xii. 4), Λιθόστρωτον, 'the Pavement' (John xix. 13); when Sir John Cheke rendered ἑκατόνταρχος, 'hundreder' (Matt. viii. 5), σεληνιαζόμενος, 'mooned' (Matt. iv. 24). But the number of words which allow of this reproduction is comparatively small. Of many the etymology is lost; many others do not admit the formation of a corresponding word in another language. This scheme, therefore, whatever advantages it may possess, can of necessity be very sparingly applied.

Another method, then, is to choose some generic word, such as must needs exist in both languages, the *genus* of which the word to be rendered is the *species*, and with-

out attempting any closer correspondence, to employ this. Our Translators have frequently taken this course; they have done so, rendering *βάτος*, *κόρος*, *χοῖνιξ*, *σάτον*, alike by 'measure' (Luke xvi. 6, 7; Rev. vi. 6; Matt. xiii. 33), with no endeavours to mark in any of these places the capacity of the measure; *δραχμή* by "piece of silver" (Luke xv. 8), *στατήρ* by "piece of money" (Matt. xvii. 27), not attempting in either case to designate the value of the coin; *ἀνθύπατος* by 'deputy' (Acts xiii. 8), *στρατηγοί* by 'magistrates' (Acts xvi. 22), *χιλίαρχος* by 'captain' (Rev. xix. 18), *σικάριοι* by 'murderers' (Acts xxi. 38), *μάγοι* by 'wise men' (Matt. ii. 1). A manifest disadvantage which attends this course is the want in the copy of that definite distinctness which the original possessed, a certain vagueness, which is given to the former, with the obliteration of all strongly marked lines.

Or, thirdly, they may seek out some special word in the language into which the translation is being made, which shall be more or less an approximative equivalent for that in whose place it stands. We have two not very happy illustrations of this scheme in 'town-clerk,' as the rendering of *γραμματεύς* (Acts xix. 35), though doubtless the town-clerk in the sixteenth and seventeenth century was a very different and far more important personage than now;[1] and 'Easter' as that of *Πάσχα* (Acts xii. 4). The

[1] T. G., the author of some *Notes and Observations upon some Passages of Scripture*, Oxford, 1646, p. 42, would substitute 'actuary,'—scarcely an improvement. He complains with justice (p. 45) that 'a worshipper' is too feeble a rendering of *νεωκόρος*, Acts xix. 35, and would put 'the sacrist' in its room; but while much might be said in favour of 'sacrist,' Hammond also suggesting it, this is just that sort of word which our Translators have every where sought to avoid.

turning of Ἑρμῆς into 'Mercurius' (Acts xiv. 12), is, in fact, another example of the same, although our Translators themselves, no doubt, were unconscious of it, seeing that in their time the essential distinction between the Greek and the Italian mythologies, and the fact that the names of the deities in the former were only adapted with more or less fitness to the deities of the latter, was unknown even to scholars.[2] This method of translating has its own serious drawback, that, although it often gives a distinct and vigorous, yet it runs the danger of conveying a more or less false, impression. Except by a very singular felicity, and one which will not often occur, the word selected, while it conveys some truth, must also convey some error bound up with the truth. Thus κοδράντης is not what we have rendered it, 'a farthing' (Mark xii. 42), and ἀσσάριον (Matt. x. 29) as little;[3] nor δηνάριον 'a penny' (Matt. xx. 2), nor μετρητής 'a firkin' (John ii. 6); not, I mean, our farthing, or penny, or firkin. So, too, if "piece of money" is a vague translation of δραχμή (Luke xv. 8), Wiclif's 'bezant' and Tyndale's 'grote' involve absolute error. Add to this the danger that the colouring of one time and age may thus be substituted for that of another, of the modern world for the ancient, a tone heathen and profane for one sacred and Christian; as when

---

[2] Curiously enough Ἑρμῆς, one of the Roman Christians whom St. Paul salutes (Rom. xvi. 13), is also rendered 'Mercurius' in Cranmer's and the Geneva Version.

[3] How far our words fail to express not merely the actual, but the relative, values of the Greek and Roman moneys for which they stand, may be seen in the fact, that the ἀσσάριον is four times more valuable than the κοδράντης, both being translated 'farthing;' and while our penny, farthing, mite stand in the relation of 1, ¼, ⅛, the δηνάριον, ἀσσάριον, and λεπτόν stand in that of 1, $\frac{1}{16}$, $\frac{1}{128}$.

Golding, in his translation of Ovid's *Metamorphosis*, calls the vestal virgins 'nuns;' as when Holland, in his *Livy* and elsewhere, talks of 'colonels,' 'wardens of the marches,' renders constantly "Pontifex Maximus" by 'Archbishop,' with much else of the like kind,—and it will be seen that the inconveniences attending this course are not small.

There remains only one way more—to take the actual word of the original, and to transplant it unchanged, or at most with a slight change in the termination,—"parce detortum,"—into the other tongue, in the trust that time and use will, little by little, cause the strangeness of it to disappear, and its meaning gradually to be acquired even by the unlearned. Plutarch in his Roman *Lives* deals thus with many Latin words, as δικτάτωρ, φουρκίφερ, Καπετώλιον; so, too, our latest Greek historian, where others had spoken of 'heavy-armed,' of 'targeteer,' of "the *leadership* of Greece," has preferred 'hoplite,' 'peltast,' "the *hegemony* of Greece." Our Translators have followed this course in respect of many Hebrew words in the Old Testament, as 'Urim,' 'Thummim,' 'ephod,' 'shekel,' 'cherub,' 'seraphim,' 'cor,' 'bath,' 'ephah;' and of some Greek in the New, as 'tetrarch,' 'proselyte,' 'Paradise,' 'pentecost,' 'Messias;' or by adopting these words from preceding translations have acquiesced in the fitness of this course. At the same time they have felt the danger of this scheme. We have no such word as 'scenopegia' (in the Rheims Version, John vii. 2); nor have we stuffed our Version with 'metretes,' 'assarion,' 'lepton,' 'sata,' 'chœnix,' 'modius,' 'hemorrhage,' and dozens more of the same kind, with which a recent translator, who designs his work as an "important contribution to practical religion," and also flatters himself that he has "adopted a thoroughly modern style," has stuffed his. The disadvantage of this course evidently

is, that in many cases the adopted word continues always an exotic for the mass of the people: it never tells its own story to them, nor becomes, so to speak, transparent with its own meaning. And therefore, as I cannot but think, the number of words of this kind which occur in Wiclif's translation, must have constituted a serious drawback to its popular character; while at the same time they testify strongly to the embarrassments which awaited the first breaker up of a new way. I refer to such words as 'architriclyn' (John ii. 8), 'prepucye' (Rom. ii. 25), 'neomenye' (Col. ii. 16), 'apocalips' (Rev. i. 1), 'diluvye' (2 Pet. ii. 5), and the like.

It is impossible to adhere with a strict consistency to any one of these devices for representing the things of one condition of society by the words of another; they must all in their turn be appealed to, even as they all will be found barely sufficient. Our Translators have employed them all. Their inclination, as compared with others, is perhaps toward the second, the least ambitious, but at the same time the safest, of these courses. Once or twice they have chosen it when one of the other ways appears manifestly preferable, as in their rendering of ἀνθύπατος by 'deputy' (Acts xiii. 7, 8, 12), 'proconsul' being ready made to their hands, with Wiclif's authority for its use.

There is another question, doubtless a perplexing one, which our Translators had to solve; I confess that I much regret the solution at which they arrived. It was this. How should they deal with the Hebrew names of places and of persons in the Old Testament, which had gradually assumed a form somewhat different from their original on the lips of Greek-speaking Jews, and which appeared in these their later Hellenistic forms in the New Testament? Should they bring them back to their original shapes? or

suffer them to stand in their later deflections? Thus, meeting *Ἠλίας* in the Greek text, should they render it 'Elias,' or 'Elijah'? We all know the answer which for the most part they gave to this question; but I am not the less deeply convinced that for the purpose of keeping vivid and strong the relations between the Old and New Testament in the minds of the great body of English hearers and readers of Scripture, they ought to have recurred to the Old Testament names; which are not merely the Hebrew, but also the English names, and which, therefore, had their right to a place in the English text; that *Ἠλίας*, for instance, should have been translated into that which is not merely its Hebrew, but also its English equivalent, 'Elijah,' and so with the others. They *have* acted so in respect of 'Jerusalem;' and, because they found *Ἱεροσόλυμα* very often in their Greek text, they did not therefore think it necessary to write 'Hierosolyma.' To measure how much we lose by the scheme which they have preferred, let us just seek to realize to ourselves the difference in the amount of awakened attention among a country congregation, which Matt. xvii. 10 would arouse, if it were read thus, "And his disciples asked him, saying, Why then say the Scribes that *Elijah* must first come?" as compared with what it now is likely to create. Elijah is a person to them; the same who once raised the widow's son, who on Mount Carmel challenged and overcame alone the army of the prophets of Baal, who went up in a fire-chariot to heaven. Elias is for them but a name.

As it is, we have a double nomenclature, and for the unlearned members of the Church a sufficiently perplexing one, for very many places and persons of the earlier Covenant. It would be curious to know how many of our people recognize the widow of 'Zarephath' (1 Kin. xvii. 9)

in the woman of 'Sarepta,' spoken of by our Lord in the synagogue of Nazareth (Luke iv. 26). And then what confusion in respect of kings and prophets and others, many of them familiar enough if they had presented themselves in their own forms, but strange and unrecognized in their Hellenistic disguise! Not to speak of 'Elijah' and 'Elias,' we have 'Elisha' and 'Eliseus' (Luke iv. 26); 'Hosea' and 'Osee' (Rom. ix. 25); 'Isaiah' and 'Esaias' (Matt. iii. 3); to which the Apocrypha adds a third form, 'Esay' (Ecclus. xlviii. 22); 'Uzziah' and 'Ozias' (Matt. i. 9); 'Abijah' and 'Abia' (Matt. i. 7); 'Kish' and 'Cis' (Acts xiii. 21); 'Hezekiah' and 'Ezekias' (Matt. i. 10); 'Terah' and 'Thara' (Luke iii. 34); 'Zechariah' and 'Zacharias' (Matt. xxiii. 35); 'Korah' and 'Core' (this last commonly pronounced as a monosyllable in our National Schools), 'Rahab' and 'Rachab,' 'Peleg' and 'Phaleg,' and (most unfortunate of all), 'Joshua' and 'Jesus.'

It is indeed hardly possible to exaggerate the confusion of which the 'Jesus' of Heb. iv. 8 must be the occasion to the great body of unlearned English readers and hearers, not to speak of a slight perplexity arising from the same cause at Acts vii. 45. The fourth chapter of the Hebrews is anyhow hard enough; it is only with strained attention that we follow the Apostle's argument. But when to its own difficulty is added for many the confusion arising from the fact that 'Jesus' is here used, not of Him whose name is above every name, but of the son of Nun, known every where in the Old Testament by the name of 'Joshua,' the perplexity to many becomes hopeless. It is in vain that our Translators have added in the margin, "that is Joshua;" for all practical purposes of excluding misconception, the note, in most of our Bibles omitted, is useless. In putting 'Jesus' here they have departed from most of our preceding

Versions, and from many foreign. Even if they had counted that the letter of their obligation as Translators, which yet I cannot think, bound them to this, one would willingly have here seen a breach of the letter, that so they might better have kept the spirit.

There is another difficulty, entailing, however, no such serious consequences, even if the best way of meeting it is not chosen: how, namely, to deal with Greek and Latin proper names? whether to make them in their terminations English, or to leave them as we find them? Our Translators in this matter adhere to no constant rule. It is not merely that some proper names drop their classical terminations, as 'Paul,' and 'Saul,' and 'Urban' (Rom. xvi. 9),[4] while others, as 'Silvanus,' which by the same rule should be 'Silvan,' and 'Mercurius,' retain it. This inconsistency is prevalent in all books which have to do with classical antiquity. There is almost no Roman history in which 'Pompey' and 'Antony' do not stand side by side with 'Augustus' and 'Tiberius.' Merivale's, who always writes 'Pompeius' and 'Antonius,' is almost the only exception which I know. If this were all, there would be little to find fault with in an irregularity almost, if not quite, universal, and in some cases hardly to be avoided without so much violence done to usage as might leave it doubtful whether the gain exceeded the loss.[5] But in our Version the same name occurs now with a Greek or Latin ending, now with an Eng-

[4] So it ought to be printed in our modern Bibles, not 'Urbane,' which is now deceptive, though it was not so according to the orthography of 1611; it suggests a trisyllable, and the termination of a female name. It is Οὐρβανόν in the original.

[5] See an article with the title, *Orthographic Mutineers*, in the *Miscellaneous Essays* of De Quincey.

lish; as though it were now 'Pompeius' and now 'Pompey,' now 'Antonius' and now 'Antony,' in the same volume, or even the same page, of some Roman history; and the fault extends to Hebrew names as well. Consistency in such details is avowedly difficult; and the difficulty of attaining it must have been much enhanced by the many hands that were engaged in our Version. But it is strange that not only in different parts of the New Testament, which proceeded from different hands,[6] we have now 'Marcus' (Col. iv. 10; Philem. 24; 1 Pet. v. 13), and now 'Mark' (Acts xii. 12, 25; 2 Tim. iv. 11); now 'Lucas' (postscript to 2 Cor.), and now 'Luke' (2 Tim. iv. 11); now 'Jeremias' (Matt. xvi. 14), and now 'Jeremy' (Matt. ii. 17); now 'Apollos' (Acts xviii. 24; xix. 1), now 'Apollo'[7] (1 Cor. iii. 22, iv. 6); now 'Noë' (Matt. xxiv. 38), and now 'Noah' (1 Pet. iii. 20); now "Simon, son of Jonas" (John xxi. 15, 16, 17), and now "Simon, son of Jona" (John i. 42); now 'Judas' (Matt. i. 2), and now 'Juda' (Luke iii. 33; Heb. vii. 14), this in respect of the Patriarch of this name, while the Apostle is now 'Judas' (Acts i. 13), and now 'Jude' (Jude 1); now 'Timotheus' (Acts xvi. 1), and now 'Timothy' (Heb. xiii. 21); but in the same chapter we have *Τιμόθεος* rendered first 'Timothy' (2 Cor. i. 1), and then 'Timotheus' (*ib.* ver. 19). In like manner we have 'Corinthus' in one place (postscript to the Ep. to the Romans), and 'Corinth' elsewhere; 'Sodoma' (Rom. ix. 29) and 'Sodom' (Matt. x. 15;

[6] In the same way it is 'Tyrus' throughout Jeremiah (xxvi. 2), and 'Tyre' throughout Isaiah (xxiii. 5).

[7] This latter form, manifestly inconvenient, as confounding the name of an eminent Christian teacher with that of a heathen deity, has been, as already remarked, tacitly removed from later editions of our Bible.

Jude 7); while the inhabitants of Crete (*Κρῆτες*) are now 'Cretes' (Acts ii. 11), which cannot be right, and now 'Cretians' (Tit. i. 12); 'Cretans' is a form preferable to both.

There are other inconsistencies in the manner of dealing with proper names. Thus, *Ἄρειος πάγος* is 'Areopagus' at Acts xvii. 19, while three verses further on it is 'Mars-hill.' In which of these ways it ought to have been translated may very fairly be a question; the subsequent mention of "Dionysius the *Areopagite*" (ver. 34) may perhaps give a preference to the former rendering; but one rendering or the other, once chosen, should have been adhered to. Then, again, if our Translators gave, as they properly did, the Latin termination to the names of cities, 'Ephes*us*,' 'Milet*us*,' not 'Ephes*os*,' 'Milet*os*,' they should have done this throughout, and written 'Ass*us*' (Acts xx. 13, 14), and 'Pergam*us*' (Rev. i. 11; ii. 12), not 'Assos' and 'Pergamos.' In regard of this last, it would have been better still if they had employed the form 'Pergam*um*;' for, while no doubt there are examples of the feminine *Πέργαμος* in Greek authors,[8] they are excessively rare, and the city's name is almost always written *Πέργαμον* in Greek, and 'Pergamum' in Latin.[9] A singular error, exactly reversing this one, the use of 'Milet*um*' at 2 Tim. iv. 20, has been often noted; an error into which our Translators would probably not have fallen themselves, but have inherited it from the Versions preceding, all which have it. Yet it is strange that they did not correct it here, seeing that it, or a similar error, 'Milet*on*,' had, at Acts xx. 15, 17, been by them

[8] Ptol. v. ii., cf. Lobeck, *Phrynichus*, p. 422.

[9] Xenophon, *Anab.* vii. 8, 8; Strabo, xiii. 4; Pliny, *H.N.* xxxv. 46.

discovered and removed, and the city's name rightly given, 'Miletus;' although in the heading even of this chapter also they have suffered 'Miletum' to stand.[10]

It is the carrying of one rule through which we desire in these matters, and this is not seldom exactly what we miss. Thus, seeing that in the enumeration of the precious stones which constitute the foundations of the New Jerusalem (Rev. xxi. 19, 20), all save two, which are capable of receiving an English termination, do receive it,—thus, 'beryl' and not 'beryllus,' 'chrysolite'[11] and not 'chrysolithus,' 'jacinth' and not 'jacinthus,' —we might fairly ask that these two, 'chrysoprasus' and 'sardius,' should not be exceptionally treated. It should therefore be 'chrysoprase,' and not 'chrysoprasus.' 'Sardius' may be objected to for a further reason. Σάρδιον,

[10] At the same time it is very possible that 'Miletum' was originally no error. In early English, as very often in German at the present day, Latin and Greek words are declined, and given the termination of that case, in which they would appear, supposing the whole sentence to have been composed in one of these languages. Thus in Wiclif's Version (Rom. xvi. 12): "Greete well Trife*nam* and Trifo*sam*." Again, in the Geneva (Acts xxvii. 7): "We scarce were come over against Gnid*um*;" in Tyndale (Acts ix. 3): "desired of him letters to Damas*co*." So too in Capgrave's *Chronicle*, p. 85: "He held the grete Councille of Chalcidony ageyn Eutic*em* the heretik." Nor has this usage wholly passed away. In Kingsley's very noble poem of *Perseus and Andromeda*, they appear, once at least, as 'Pers*ea*' and 'Andromed*en*.' I cannot, however, think that this allowing the proper names which we use to assert the rights of their own grammar against those of the English has any such merits that it should be re-introduced among us. In an English sentence they must learn to accommodate themselves to English ways.

[11] Mis-spelt 'chrysol*y*te,' and the etymology obscured, in all our modern editions, but correctly given in the exemplar edition of 1611.

not σάρδιος, is the Greek name of this stone, as 'sarda' is the Latin; and σάρδιος here is an adjective (*sardius* lapis, Tertullian), quite as much as σάρδινος at Rev. iv. 3, λίθος, which is there exprest, being here understood. It would have been, therefore, more correct to translate "a sardine stone" here, as has been done there. Two other ways, indeed, lay before our Translators. 'Sard' has been naturalized in English; it is used in Holland's *Pliny*; and they might have adopted this; or, best of all, as it seems to me, they might have boldly ventured upon 'ruby,' which in all likelihood this stone was, and which otherwise we miss in the present enumeration of precious stones, though it is very unlikely that a stone so prized should be absent here. 'Sardius,' which they *have* employed, seems anyhow incorrect, though the Vulgate may be quoted in its favour.

Hammond affirms, and I must needs consider with reason, that "Tres Tabernæ" should have been left in its Latin form (Acts xxviii. 15), and not rendered "The Three Taverns." It is a proper name, just as much as "Appii Forum," which occurs in the same verse, and which rightly we have not resolved into "The Market of Appius." Had we left "Tres Tabernæ" untouched (I observe De Wette does so), we should then have only dealt as the sacred historian has himself dealt with it, who has merely written it in Greek letters, not turned it into equivalent Greek words. As little should we have turned it into English

Sometimes our Translators have carried too far, as I cannot but think, the turning of qualitative genitives into adjectives. Oftentimes it is prudently done, and with a due recognition of the Hebrew idiom which has moulded and modified the Greek phrase with which they have to

deal. Thus, "forgetful hearer" is unquestionably better than "hearer of forgetfulness" (Jam. i. 25); "his natural face" than "face of his nature," or "of his generation" (*ib.*); "unjust steward" than "steward of injustice" (Luke xvi. 8). Yet at other times they have done this without necessity, and occasionally with manifest loss. "Deceitful lusts" is a very unsatisfactory substitute for "lusts of deceit" (Eph. iv. 22). "Son of his love," which the Rheims version has, would have been better than "beloved son"[12] (Col. i. 13); "the gospel of the glory" than "the glorious gospel" (1 Tim. i. 11); and certainly "the body of our vileness," or "of our humiliation," better than "our vile body;" "the body of his glory" than "his glorious body" (Phil. iii. 21). "The uncertainty of riches," as it is in the Rheims, would be more accurate than "uncertain riches" (1 Tim. vi. 17); "appearing of the glory," as in the Geneva, than "glorious appearing" (Tit. ii. 13); "children of the curse" than "cursed children" (2 Pet. ii. 14); in which last case it has been forgotten that there was a second Hebraism, that, namely, inherent in 'children,' to deal with.[13] Οἰκονομία Θεοῦ can never mean "godly edifying" (1 Tim. i. 4). "The glorious liberty of the children of God" (Rom. viii. 21) not merely comes short of, but expresses something very different from, "the liberty of the glory of the children of God" (see Alford, in loco). Doubtless the accumulated genitives are in this last place awkward to deal with: it was probably to avoid

[12] Augustine (*De Trin.* xv. 19) lays a dogmatic stress on the genitive ("Filius caritatis ejus nullus est alius, quam qui de substantiâ Ejus est genitus"), but this may be questioned.

[13] See some good observations on this phrase in Scholefield's *Hints*, in loco, p. 159.

them that the translation assumed its present shape; but still, when higher interests are at stake, such awkwardness must be endured, and elsewhere our Translators have not shrunk from it, as at Rev. xvi. 19: "The cup of the wine of the fierceness of his wrath."

Calvary is a word so consecrated for us, that one is almost unwilling to urge that it has no right to a place in our Bibles; and yet it certainly has none, and we owe to the Vulgate, or rather to the influence of Latin Christianity, that we find it there: "When they were come to the place which is called *Calvary*, there they crucified Him" (Luke xxiii. 33). But this *Κρανίον* ought either to be dealt with as a proper name, in which case 'Cranium' would be the right rendering, or else translated, in which case 'A Skull,' not "The place of a skull," as in the margin here, this being drawn from Matt. xxvii. 33. In no case can recourse be had rightly to the Latin; or a Latin name, and one which did not, as applied to this place, exist till many centuries after, be properly employed. The same reasons which made 'Calvaria' (being the name for a skull in the silver age of Latinity), appropriate in the Latin translation, make 'Calvary' inappropriate in ours. At the same time I would much rather lie under the charge of inconsequence than suggest that it should be now disturbed.

CHAPTER V.

ON SOME UNNECESSARY DISTINCTIONS INTRODUCED.

IT may be well, before entering on this subject, to make one remark, which, having an especial reference to the subject-matter of this and the following chapter, more or less bears upon all. I have already observed, that the advantages were great, of coming, as our Translators did, in the rear of other translators, of inheriting from those who went before them so large an amount of work well done, of successful renderings, of phrases consecrated already by long usage in the Church. It was a signal gain that they had not, in the fabric which they were constructing, to make a new framework throughout, but needed only here and there to insert new materials where the old from any cause were faulty or out of date; that of them it was not demanded that they should make a translation where none existed before; nor yet, as they have remarked themselves, that they should bring a good translation out of bad or indifferent ones; but only a best, and that out of many good ones preceding. None who have ever been engaged in the task of transferring from one language to another, but will freely acknowledge that in this their gain was most real; and they well understood how to turn these advantages to account.

Yet vast as these, doubtless, were, they were not without certain accompanying drawbacks. He who revises, above

all when he addresses himself to the task of revision with a confidence, here abundantly justified, in the general excellency of that which he is revising, is in constant danger of allowing his vigilance to sleep, and of thus passing over errors, which he would not himself have originated, had he been thrown altogether on his own resources. I cannot but think that in this way the watchfulness of our Translators, or revisers rather, has been sometimes remitted; and that errors and inconsistencies, which they would not themselves have introduced, they have yet passed by and allowed. A large proportion of the faults in our Translation are thus an inheritance from former versions. This is not, indeed, any excuse, for they who, with full power to remove, passed them by, became responsible for them; but is merely mentioned as the probable explanation of many among them. With this much of introduction, I will pass on to the proper subject of this chapter.

Our Translators sometimes create distinctions, which have no counterparts in their original, by using two or more words to render at different places, or it may be at the same place, a single word in the Greek text.[1]

After what has been urged in a preceding chapter, it will be readily understood that we by no means make a general complaint against them, that they have varied their words, where there is no variation in the original. Oftentimes this was inevitable; or, if not inevitable, was certainly the more excellent way. What we do complain of is that they have done this where it was wholly gratuitous, and sometimes where the force, clearness and precision of the original have consequently suffered not a little. It is true

[1] Hugh Broughton has some good remarks on this subject, *Works*,

that what they did here they did more or less with their eyes open, and not altogether of oversight; and it will be only fair to hear what they, in an *Address to the Reader*, now seldom or never reprinted, but, on many accounts, well worthy of being so,[2] say upon this matter; and how they

[2] Their "pedantic and uncouth preface" Symonds calls it. There would certainly be pedantry in any one now writing with such richness and fulness of learned allusion, a pedantry from which our comparatively scanty stores of classical and ecclesiastical learning would in most cases effectually preserve us. But this preface is, on many grounds, a most interesting study, chiefly, indeed, as giving at considerable length, and in various aspects, the view of our Translators themselves in regard of the work which they had undertaken; while 'uncouth' as this objector calls it, every true knower of our language will acknowledge it a masterpiece of English composition. Certainly it would not be easy to find a more beautiful or more affecting piece of writing than the twenty or thirty lines with which the fourth paragraph, '*On the praise of the Holy Scriptures*,' concludes. And this much I will quote of it, for its own sake, and in the hope that I may thus assist a little in drawing this preface from the obscurity and forgetfulness into which it has been so strangely allowed to fall: "Men talk much of εἰρεσιώνη, how many sweet and goodly things it had hanging on it; of the Philosopher's stone, that it turneth copper into gold; of Cornu-copia, that it had all things necessary for food in it; of Panaces the herb, that it was good for all diseases; of Catholicon the drug, that it is instead of all purges; of Vulcan's Armour, that it was an armour of proof against all thrusts, and all blows, &c. Well, that which they falsely or vainly attributed to these things for bodily good, we may justly and with full measure ascribe unto the Scripture for spiritual. It is not only an armour, but also a whole armoury of weapons, both offensive and defensive, whereby we may save ourselves and put the enemy to flight. It is not an herb, but a tree, or rather a whole paradise of trees of life, which bring forth fruit every month, and the fruit thereof is for meat, and the leaves for medicine. It is not a pot of manna or a cruse of oil, which were for memory only, or for a meal's meat or

defend the course which they have adopted. These are their words: "Another thing we think good to admonish thee of (gentle reader), that we have not tied ourselves to an uniformity of phrasing, or to an identity of words, as some peradventure would wish that we had done, because they observe, that some learned men somewhere have been as exact as they could that way. Truly, that we might not vary from the sense of that which we had translated before, if the word signified the same in both places (for there be some words be not of the same sense every where), we were especially careful, and made a conscience according to our duty. But that we should express the same notion in the same particular word; as, for example, if

---

two, but as it were a shower of heavenly bread sufficient for a whole host, be it never so great, and as it were a whole cellar full of oil-vessels; whereby all our necessities may be provided for, and our debts discharged. In a word, it is a Panary of wholesome food against fenowed traditions; a Physician's shop (St. Basil calleth it) of preservatives against poisoned heresies; a Pandect of profitable laws against rebellious spirits; a treasure of most costly jewels, against beggarly rudiments; finally, a fountain of most pure water springing up unto everlasting life. And what marvel? the original thereof being from heaven, not from earth; the Author being GOD, not man; the Enditer, the Holy Spirit, not the wit of the Apostles or Prophets; the Penmen, such as were sanctified from the womb, and endued with a principal portion of GOD'S Spirit; the matter, verity, piety, purity, uprightness; the form, GOD'S Word, GOD'S testimony, GOD'S oracles, the word of truth, the word of salvation, &c.; the effects, light of understanding, stableness of persuasion, repentance from dead works, newness of life, holiness, peace, joy in the Holy Ghost; lastly, the end and reward of the study thereof, fellowship with the saints, participation of the heavenly nature, fruition of an inheritance immortal, undefiled, and that never shall fade away: Happy is the man that delighteth in the Scripture, and thrice happy that meditateth in it day and night."

we translate the Hebrew or Greek word once by *purpose*, never to call it *intent;* if one where *journeying*, never *travelling;* if one where *think*, never *suppose;* if one where *pain*, never *ache;* if one where *joy*, never *gladness*, &c., thus to mince the matter, we thought to savour more of curiosity than wisdom, and that rather it would breed scorn in the atheist, than bring profit to the godly reader. For is the kingdom of God become words or syllables? why should we be in bondage to them, if we may be free, use one precisely, when we may use another no less fit, as commodiously? We might also be charged (by scoffers) with some unequal dealing toward a great number of good English words. For as it is written of a certain great philosopher, that he should say, that those logs were happy that were made images to be worshipped; for their fellows, as good as they, lay for blocks behind the fire: so if we should say, as it were, unto certain words, Stand up higher, have a place in the Bible always, and to others of like quality, Get ye hence, be banished for ever, we might be taxed peradventure with St. James's words, namely, 'To be partial in our selves and judges of evil thoughts.'"

Such is their explanation—to me, I confess, an insufficient one, whatever ingenuity may be ascribed to it; and for these reasons insufficient. It is clearly the office of translators to put the reader of the translation, as nearly as may be, on the same vantage-ground as the reader of the original; to give him, so far as this is attainable, the same assistances for understanding his author's meaning. Now every exact and laborious student of the Greek Testament knows that there is almost no such help in some passage of difficulty, doctrinal or other, as to turn to his Greek Concordance, to search out every other passage in which the word or words wherein the difficulty seems chiefly to

reside, occur, and closely to observe their usage there. It is manifestly desirable that the reader of the English Bible should have, as nearly as possible, the same resource. But if, where there is one and the same word in the original, there are two, three, half-a-dozen in the version, he is in the main deprived of it. Thus he hears the doctrine of the atonement discussed; he would fain turn to all the passages where 'atonement' occurs; he finds only one (Rom. v. 11), and of course is unaware that in other passages where he meets 'reconciling' and 'reconciliation' (Rom. xi. 15; 2 Cor. v. 18, 19), it is the same word in the original. In words like this, which are, so to speak, *sedes doctrinæ*, one regrets, above all, variation and uncertainty in rendering.

I confess that I would fain see more even than this—not merely that each word in one language should have its fixed and recognized equivalent in the other, not to be exchanged for any other, unless on the clearest necessity, and in exceptional cases; but it would be further desirable that where words had budded, and other words grown out of them, κυριότης, for example, out of κύριος, in such a case, if κύριος had been rendered 'lord,' then κυριότης should be 'lordship' and not 'dominion;' that if δίκαιος is 'righteous,' δικαιοσύνη shall be 'righteousness'—if, on the other hand, δίκαιος is 'just,' then let δικαιοσύνη be 'justice;' that, in fact, not merely word should answer word, but family should correspond to family. It is much indeed that we here demand; and we only demand it as an ideal towards which the nearest attainable approach should be made; being, as it is, probably far more than *any* language could render, certainly far more than our own. A circumstance which, in many aspects, constitutes our riches, namely, that the English language has two factors, a Pelasgic and a Gothic, and that thus we have often duplicate words, where other

languages,—the German for example,—have but a single one, as 'just' and 'justice' side by side with 'righteous' and 'righteousness,' or still more remarkably, 'saint,' 'saintly,' 'sanctify,' 'sanctification,' 'sanctity,' over against 'holy one,' 'holy,' 'hallow,' 'hallowing,' 'holiness;' this circumstance, in some of the consequences which have followed from it, works often injuriously so far as the fulfilling our present demand is concerned. The consequences I refer to are these, namely that, as continually will happen, neither group is complete, some words having dropped out from each, and, only between them and by their joint contributions, the whole body of needful words is made up. For instance, our Translators use often 'righteous' for δίκαιος, and always, I believe, 'righteousness' for δικαιοσύνη. But they have presently to deal with δικαιόω and δικαίωσις. There are gaps here in our Saxon group; no help to be found in that quarter—no choice therefore but to take up with the Latin, 'to justify,' and 'justification,' and this, moreover, with the certainty that the etymology of 'justificare,' the word which they were compelled to use ("justum *facere*"), would be turned against that truth which they most loved to assert, and which δικαιοῦν did itself so plainly declare. Then too, while πίστις is 'faith,' and πιστός 'faithful,' when we reach πιστεύειν there is no proceeding further in this line: we betake ourselves perforce to 'believe,' a word excellent in itself, but with the serious drawback, that it belongs to quite another family, and stands in no connexion with 'faith' and 'faithful' at all. Observe, for example, how through this the loop and link connecting the great eleventh chapter of the Hebrews with the last verse of the chapter preceding has been dropped in our Version, and the most natural transition obscured.

But without pressing this further, and returning to

the main proposition of this chapter, which is, that a Greek word should have, so far as possible, its fixed and unchanged representative in English, the losses which ensue from the neglect, or the non-recognition, of this rule may be shown to be considerable. Thus it will sometimes happen, that when St. Paul is pursuing a close train of reasoning, and one which demands severest attention, the difficulties of his argument, not small in themselves, are aggravated by the use on the Translators' part of different words where he has used the same; the word being sometimes the very key to the whole argument. It is thus in the fourth chapter of the Romans. Λογίζομαι occurs eleven times in this chapter. We may say that it is the key-word to St. Paul's argument throughout, being every where employed most strictly in the same, and that a technical and theological, sense. But our Translators have no fixed rule of rendering it. Twice they render it 'count' (ver. 3, 5); six times 'impute' (ver. 6, 8, 11, 22, 23, 24); and three times 'reckon' (ver. 4, 9, 10); while at Gal. iii. 6, they introduce a fourth rendering, 'account.' Let the student read this chapter, employing every where 'reckon,' or, which would be better, every where 'impute,' and observe how much of clearness and precision St. Paul's argument would in this way acquire.

In other places no doctrine is in danger of being obscured, but still the change is uncalled for and sometimes perplexing. Thus what confusion arises from turning ἄβυσσος, which in the Revelations is always translated "the bottomless pit" (ix. 1, 2, 11, and often), into "the deep" (Luke viii. 31); above all when this "deep," which it needs not to say is the φυλακή,—that forlorn province of the Hades-world which is the receptacle of lost spirits,—is

so liable, as it is here, to be confounded with 'the lake' ('the sea,' Matt. viii. 32), mentioned immediately after.

Or in other ways the variation is injurious. Take, for instance, Rev. iv. 4: "And round about the *throne* (*θρόνου*) were four-and-twenty *seats*" (*θρόνοι*). It is easy to see the motive of this variation; and yet if the inspired Apostle was visited with no misgivings lest the creature should seem to be encroaching on the dignity of the Creator, and it is clear that he was not,—on the contrary, he has, in the most marked manner, brought the *throne* of God and the *thrones* of the elders together,—certainly the Translators need not have been more careful than he had been, nor made the elders to sit on 'seats,' and only God on a 'throne.' This august company of the four-and-twenty elders represents the Church of the Old and the New Testament, each in its twelve heads; but how much is lost by turning their 'thrones' into 'seats;' for example, the connexion of this Scripture with Matt. xix. 28; and with all the promises that Christ's servants should not merely see his glory, but share it, that they should be *σύνθρονοι* with Him (Rev. iii. 21), this little change obscuring the truth that they are here set before us as *συμβασιλεύοντες* (1 Cor. iv. 8; 2 Tim. ii. 12), as kings reigning with Him. This truth is saved, indeed, by the mention of the golden crowns on their heads, but is implied also in their sitting, as they do in the Greek, but not in the English, on seats of equal dignity with his, on 'thrones.' The same scruple which dictated this change makes itself felt through the whole translation of the Apocalypse, and to a manifest loss. In that book is set forth, as nowhere else in Scripture, the hellish parody of the heavenly kingdom; the conflict between the true King of the earth and the usurping king; the loss, therefore, is evident, when for "Satan's

throne" is substituted "Satan's *seat*" (ii. 13); for "the *throne* of the beast," "the *seat* of the beast" (xvi. 10).

A great master of language will often implicitly refer in some word which he uses to the same word, or, it may be, to another of the same group or family, which he or some one else has just used before; and where there is evidently intended such an allusion, it should, wherever this is possible, be reproduced in the translation. There are two examples of this in St. Paul's discourse at Athens, both of which have been effaced in our Version. Of those who encountered Paul in the market at Athens, some said, "He seemeth to be *a setter forth* of strange gods" (Acts xvii. 18). They use the word καταγγελεύς; and he, remembering and taking up this word, retorts it upon them: "Whom, therefore, ye ignorantly worship, Him *declare I* unto you" (ver. 23); so our Translators; but better, "Him *set I forth* (καταγγέλλω) unto you." He has their charge present in his mind, and this is his answer to their charge. It would more plainly appear such to the English reader, if the Translators, having used "setter forth" before, had thus returned upon the word, instead of substituting, as they have done, 'declare' for it. The Rheims version, which has 'preacher' and 'preach,' after 'annuntiator' and 'annuntio' of the Vulgate, has been careful to retain and indicate the connexion.

But the finer and more delicate turns of the divine rhetoric of St. Paul are more seriously affected by another oversight in the same verse. We make him there say, "As I passed by, and beheld your devotions, I found an altar with this inscription, To the *Unknown* God (ἀγνώστῳ Θεῷ). Whom, therefore, ye *ignorantly* (ἀγνοοῦντες) worship, Him declare I unto you." But if any thing is clear, it is that St. Paul in ἀγνοοῦντες intends to take up the

preceding ἀγνώστῳ; the chime of the words, and also, probably, the fact of their etymological connexion, leading him to this. He has spoken of their altar to an "*Unknown* God," and he proceeds, "whom, therefore, ye worship *unknowing*, Him declare I unto you." 'Ignorantly' has the further objection that it conveys more of rebuke than St. Paul, who is sparing his hearers to the uttermost, intended.

In other passages also the point of a sentence lies in the recurrence and repetition of the same word, which yet they have failed to repeat; as in these which follow:

1 Cor. iii. 17.—"If any man *defile* (φθείρει) the temple of God, him shall God *destroy* (φθερεῖ)." It is the fearful law of retaliation which is here proclaimed. He who *ruins* shall himself be *ruined* in turn. It shall be done to him, as he has done to the temple of God. Undoubtedly it is hard to get the right word, which will suit in both places. 'Corrupt' is the first which suggests itself; yet it would not do to say, "If any man *corrupt* the temple of God, him shall God *corrupt*." The difficulty which our Translators felt, it is evident that the Vulgate felt the same, which in like manner, has changed its word: "Si quis autem templum Dei *violaverit*, *disperdet* illum Deus." Yet why should not the verse be rendered, "If any man *destroy* the temple of God, him shall God *destroy*"?

Matt. xxi. 41.—"He will *miserably* destroy those *wicked* men." A difficulty of exactly the same kind exists here; where yet the κακοὺς κακῶς of the original ought, in some way or other, to have been preserved; as in this way it might very sufficiently be: "He will *miserably* destroy those *miserable* men;" their doom shall correspond to their condition; as this is, so shall be that. Neither would it have been hard at 2 Thess. i. 6, to retain the play upon words, and to have rendered τοῖς θλίβουσιν

ὑμᾶς θλῖψιν, "*affliction* to them that *afflict* you," instead of "*tribulation* to them that *trouble* you," there being no connexion in English between the words 'tribulation' and 'trouble,' though some likeness in sound: while yet the very purpose of the passage is to show that what wicked men have measured to others shall be measured to them again.

Let me indicate other examples of the same kind, where the loss is manifest. Who can doubt that the ἱκάνωσεν of 2 Cor. iii. 6 is an echo of ἱκανοί and ἱκανότης of the verse preceding? With the assistance of 'able' and 'ability,' or 'ableness,' as Tyndale has it, or else with 'sufficient' and 'sufficiency,' it would have been easy to let this echo be heard in the English no less than in the Greek. Again, if at Gal. iii. 22, συνέκλεισεν is translated "hath concluded," συγκλειόμενοι in the next verse, which takes it up, should not be rendered "shut up." The Vulgate has well, 'conclusit' and 'conclusi.' Let the reader substitute "hath shut up" for "hath concluded" in ver. 22, and then read the passage. He will be at once aware of the gain. In like manner, let him take Rom. vii. 7, and read, "I had not known *lust* (ἐπιθυμίαν) except the law had said, Thou shalt not *lust* (οὐκ ἐπιθυμήσεις);" or Phil. ii. 13, "It is God which *worketh* (ὁ ἐνεργῶν) in you both to will and *to work* (τὸ ἐνεργεῖν);" and the passages will come out with a strength and clearness which they have not now. Not otherwise, if at 2 Thess. ii. 6, τὸ κατέχον is rendered "what *withholdeth*," ὁ κατέχων in the verse following should not be "he who *letteth*." While, undoubtedly, there is significance in the impersonal τὸ κατέχον exchanged for the personal ὁ κατέχων, there can be no doubt that they refer to one and the same person or institution; but this is obscured by the

change of word. In like manner, one would have gladly seen the connexion between λειπόμενοι and λείπεται at Jam. i. 4, 5, reproduced in our Version. 'Lacking' and 'lack,' which our previous versions had, would have done it. The "patience and *comfort* of the Scriptures" (Rom. xv. 4) is derived from "the God of patience and *comfort*" (ver. 5); for so one willingly would have read it; and not 'consolation' as it now in this latter verse stands, causing a slight obscuration of the connexion between the 'comfort' and God, the Author of the 'comfort.' Our Version at 2 Cor. i. 3-7 veers in the same way needlessly backward and forward, rendering παράκλησις four times by 'consolation,' and twice by 'comfort.'

How many readers have read in the English the third chapter of St. John, and missed the remarkable connexion between our Lord's words at ver. 11, and the Baptist's taking up of those words at ver. 32; and this because μαρτυρία is translated 'witness' on the former occasion, and 'testimony' on the latter. Why, again, we may ask, should ὕβρις καὶ ζημία be "hurt and damage" at Acts xxvii. 10; and "harm and loss," at their recurrence, ver. 21? Both versions are good, and it would not much import which had been selected; but whichever had been employed on the first occasion ought also to have been employed on the second. St. Paul, repeating in the midst of the danger the very words which he had used when counselling his fellow voyagers how they might avoid that danger, would remind them, that so he might obtain a readier hearing now, of that neglected warning of his, which the sequel had only justified too well.

Of these and some other examples in the like kind, which I shall offer before leaving this part of the subject, some are so little significant that they might well be passed

by, if any thing could be counted wholly insignificant, which helps or hinders ever so little the more exact setting forth of the Word of God. Thus, if in the parable of the Labourers in the Vineyard (Matt. xx. 1), *οἰκοδεσπότης* is 'householder' at ver. 1, it should scarcely be "goodman of the house" at ver. 11.[3] As little should the "*governor* of the feast" of John ii. 8, be the "*ruler* of the feast" in the very next verse; or the "goodly apparel" of Jam. ii. 2, be the "gay clothing" of the verse following, the words of the original in each case remaining unchanged. Then why should not *λάμπει* and *λαμψάτω* (Matt. v. 15, 16) reappear in our Version in the intimate relation wherein the Lord evidently means them to stand? Seeing too that He is especially urging the *mercy*, which they who have found mercy are bound in return to show, that here is the very point of the reproach which the King addresses to the unmerciful servant (Matt. xviii. 33), *ἐλεεῖν* ought either to have been translated "have *pity*" or else "have *compassion*" in both clauses of the verse, but not first by one phrase, then by the other.

Again, it would have been clearly desirable that where

---

[3] Scholefield (*Hints*, p. 8) further objects to this last rendering as having "a quaintness in it not calculated to recommend it." But it had nothing of the kind at the time our Translation was made. Compare Spenser, *Fairy Queen*, iv. 5, 34:

> "There entering in, they found the *goodman* self
> Full busily upon his work ybent."

And still more to the point, in Holland's *Plutarch*, p. 200: "Finding by good fortune *the good man of the house* within, [he] asked for bread and water." So in Golding's *Ovid*, b. i.:

> "The *goodman* seeks the goodwive's death;"

this last quotation showing how entirely all ethical sense had departed from the word, as now from the French 'bonhomme.'

in two, sometimes it is in three, Gospels exactly the same words, recording the same event or the same conversation, occur in the original, the identity should have been expressed by the use of exactly the same words in the English. This continually is not the case. Thus, Matt. xxvi. 41, and Mark xiv. 38, exactly correspond in the Greek, while in the translation the words appear in St. Matthew: "Watch and pray, *that* ye enter *not* into temptation; the spirit *indeed* is *willing*, but the flesh is weak;" in St. Mark: "Watch *ye* and pray, *lest* ye enter into temptation; the spirit *truly* is *ready*, but the flesh is weak." Again, the words Matt. xix. 20, and Mark x. 20, exactly agree in the original; they are far from so doing in our Version: in St. Matthew: "All these *things* have I *kept* from my youth *up*;" in St. Mark: "All these have I *observed* from my youth." So too, "Thy faith hath *saved* thee," of Luke vii. 50, represents exactly the same words as, "Thy faith hath *made thee whole*," of Luke xvii. 19: and compare Matt. xx. 16 with xxii. 14.

It may seem a mere trifle that ζώνη δερματίνη is "a leathern girdle" in St. Matthew (iii. 4), and "a girdle of a skin" in the parallel passage of St. Mark (i. 6); yet, not to urge the purely gratuitous character of this and similar variations, it must not be forgotten that through them a most interesting question, opening into boundless fields of inquiry, namely the exact relation of the four several Gospels to one another, and the extent to which one sacred writer may have availed himself of the work of a predecessor, is entirely foreclosed to the English reader. "There is no reason," it has been well said, "why such interesting discussions as those contained in Michaëlis, and the notes of his learned translator and commentator, Bishop Marsh, with reference to the correspondence, verbal or substantial,

and also to the variances, of the different Gospel narratives, should not be as open to an English reader as to the Greek scholar. While the harmony of many passages, common to two or more Evangelists, whether, as in some cases, it be perfect, or, as in others, only substantial, bears in so interesting a manner on the questions involved in the discussions alluded to, our Version seems based on a studied design to confound and mislead as to the actual facts."

Not otherwise, in a quotation from the Old Testament, if two or more sacred writers quote it in absolutely identical words, this fact ought to be reproduced in the Version. It is not so in respect of the important quotation from Gen. xv. 6; but on the three occasions that it is quoted (Rom. iv. 3; Gal. iii. 6; Jam. ii. 23), it appears with variations, slight, indeed, and not in the least affecting the sense, but yet which would better have been avoided. Again, the phrase, *ὀσμὴ εὐωδίας*, occurring twice in the New Testament, has so fixed, I may say, so technical a significance, referring as it does to a continually recurring phrase of the Old Testament, that it should not be rendered on one occasion, "a sweet-smelling savour" (Eph. v. 2), on the other, "an odour of a sweet smell" (Phil. iv. 18).

In other ways interesting and important relations between different parts of Scripture would come out more strongly, if what is precisely similar in the original had reappeared as precisely similar in the translation. The Epistles to the Ephesians and to the Colossians profess to have been sent from Rome to the East by the same messenger (cf. Eph. vi. 21, 22; Col. iv. 7, 8); they were written therefore, we may confidently conclude, about the same time. When we come to examine their internal structure, this exactly bears out what under such circum-

stances we should expect in letters proceeding from the pen of St. Paul—great differences, but at the same time remarkable points of contact and resemblance, both in the thoughts and in the words which are the garment of the thoughts. Paley has urged this as an internal evidence for the truth of those statements which these Epistles make about themselves.[4] This internal evidence, to which he appeals, doubtless exists even now for the English reader; but it would press itself on his attention much more strongly, if the exact resemblances in the originals had been represented by exact resemblances in the copies. This oftentimes has not been the case. Striking coincidences in language between one Epistle and the other, which exist in the Greek, do not exist in the English. For example, *ἐνέργεια* is 'working,' Eph. i. 19; it is 'operation,' Col. ii. 12: *ταπεινοφροσύνη* is 'lowliness,' Eph. iv. 2; "humbleness of mind," Col. iii. 12: *συμβιβαζόμενον* is 'compacted,' Eph. iv. 16; "knit together," Col. ii. 19; with much more of the same kind; as is accurately brought out by the late Professor Blunt,[5] who draws one of the chief motives why the Clergy should study the Scriptures in the original languages, from the shortcomings which exist in the translations of them.

Before leaving this branch of the subject, I will take a few words, and note the variety of rendering to which they are submitted in our Version. I have not taken them altogether at random, yet some of these are by no means the most remarkable instances in their kind. They will, however, sufficiently illustrate the matter in hand.

---

[4] *Horæ Paulinæ*, vi. § 2.

[5] *Duties of the Parish Priest*, p. 71. The whole section (pp. 47-76) is eminently instructive.

Ἀθετέω, 'to reject' (Mark vi. 26); 'to despise' (Luke x. 16); 'to bring to nothing' (1 Cor. i. 19); 'to frustrate' (Gal. ii. 21); 'to disannul' (Gal. iii. 15); 'to cast off' (1 Tim. v. 12).

Ἀναστατόω, 'to turn upside down' (Acts xvii. 6); 'to make an uproar' (Acts xxi. 38); 'to trouble' (Gal. v. 12).

Ἀποκάλυψις, 'revelation' (Rom. ii. 5); 'manifestation' (Rom. viii. 19); 'coming' (1 Cor. i. 7); 'appearing' (1 Pet. i. 7).

Δελεάζω, 'to entice' (Jam. i. 14); 'to beguile' (2 Pet. ii. 14); 'to allure' (2 Pet. ii. 18).

Ἐλέγχω, 'to tell of [his] trespass' (Matt. xviii. 15); 'to reprove' (John xvi. 8); 'to convict' (John viii. 9); 'to convince' (John viii. 46); 'to rebuke' (1 Tim. v. 20).

Ζόφος, 'darkness' (2 Pet. ii. 4); 'mist' (2 Pet. ii. 17); 'blackness' (Jude 13).

Καταργέω, 'to cumber' (Luke xiii. 7); 'to make without effect' (Rom. iii. 3); 'to make void' (Rom. iii. 31); 'to make of none effect' (Rom. iv. 14); 'to destroy' (Rom. vi. 6); 'to loose' (Rom. vii. 2); 'to deliver' (Rom. vii. 6); 'to bring to nought' (1 Cor. i. 8); 'to do away' (1 Cor. xiii. 10); 'to put away' (1 Cor. xiii. 11); 'to put down' (1 Cor. xv. 24); 'to abolish' (2 Cor. iii. 13). Add to these, *καταργέομαι*, 'to come to nought' (1 Cor. ii. 6); 'to fail' (1 Cor. xiii. 8); 'to vanish away' (ibid.); 'to become of none effect' (Gal. v. 4); 'to cease' (Gal. v. 11); and we have here seventeen different renderings of this word, occurring in all twenty-seven times in the New Testament.

Καταρτίζω, 'to mend' (Matt. iv. 21); 'to perfect' (Matt. xxi. 16); 'to fit' (Rom. ix. 22); 'to perfectly join together' (1 Cor. i. 10); 'to restore' (Gal. vi. 1); 'to pre-

pare' (Heb. x. 5); 'to frame' (Heb. xi. 3); 'to make perfect' (Heb. xiii. 21).

Καυχάομαι, 'to make boast' (Rom. ii. 17); 'to rejoice' (Rom. v. 2); 'to glory' (Rom. v. 3); 'to joy' (Rom. v. 11); 'to boast' (2 Cor. vii. 14).

Κρατέω, 'to take' (Matt. ix. 25); 'to lay hold on' (Matt. xii. 11); 'to lay hands on' (Matt. xviii. 28); 'to hold fast' (Matt. xxvi. 48); 'to hold' (Matt. xxviii. 9); 'to keep' (Mark ix. 10); 'to retain' (John xx. 23); 'to obtain' (Acts xxvii. 13).

Παρακαλέω, 'to comfort' (Matt. ii. 18); 'to beseech' (Matt. viii. 5); 'to desire' (Matt. xviii. 32); 'to pray' (Matt. xxvi. 53); 'to entreat' (Luke xv. 28); 'to exhort' (Acts ii. 40); 'to call for' (Acts xxviii. 20).

Πατριά, 'lineage' (Luke ii. 4); 'kindred' (Acts iii. 25); 'family' (Ephes. iii. 15).

Let me once more observe, in leaving this part of the subject, that I would not for an instant imply that in all these places one and the same English word could have been employed, but only that the variety might have been much smaller than it actually is.

111064

CHAPTER VI.

ON SOME REAL DISTINCTIONS EFFACED.

IF it is impossible, as has been shown already, in every case to render one word in the original by one word, constantly employed, in the translation, equally impossible is it, as was shown at the same time, to render in every case different words in the original by different words in the translation; it continually happening that one language possesses, and fixes in words, distinctions of which another takes no note. But with the freest recognition of this, the forces and capacities of a language should be stretched to the uttermost, the riches of its synonyms thoroughly searched out; and not till this is done, not till its resources prove plainly insufficient to the task, ought translators to acquiesce in the disappearance from their copy of distinctions which existed in the original from which that copy was made, or to count that, notwithstanding this disappearance, they have accomplished all that lay on them to accomplish. More might assuredly have been here done than has by our Translators been attempted, as I will endeavour by a few examples to prove.

Thus, one must always regret, and the regret has been often expressed,—it was so by Broughton almost as soon as our Version was published,[1]—that in the Apocalypse

[1] Of the ζῶα, or 'wights,' as he and other of our early divines called them, he says, in language hardly too strong, "they are barbarously translated *beasts*." *Works*, p. 639.

our Translators should have rendered *θηρίον* and *ζῶον* by the same word, 'beast.' Both play important parts in the book; both belong to its higher symbolism; but to portions the most different. The *ζῶα* or "living creatures," which stand before the throne, in which dwells the fulness of all creaturely life, as it gives praise and glory to God (iv. 6, 7, 8, 9; v. 6; vi. 1; and often) form part of the *heavenly* symbolism; the *θηρία*, the first beast and the second, which rise up, one from the bottomless pit (xi. 7), the other from the sea (xiii. 1), of which the one makes war upon the two Witnesses, the other opens his mouth in blasphemies, these form part of the *hellish* symbolism. To confound these and those under a common designation, to call those 'beasts' and these 'beasts,' would be an oversight, even granting the name to be suitable to both; it is a more serious one, when the word used, bringing out, as this must, the predominance of the lower animal life, is applied to glorious creatures in the very court and presence of Heaven. The error is common to all the translations. That the Rheims should not have escaped it is strange; for the Vulgate renders *ζῶα* by 'animalia' ('animantia' would have been still better), and only *θηρίον* by 'bestia.' If *ζῶα* had always been rendered "living creatures," this would have had the additional advantage of setting these symbols of the Apocalypse, even for the English reader, in an unmistakeable connexion with Ezek. i. 5, 13, 14, and often; where "living creature" is the rendering in our English Version of חַיָּה, as *ζῶον* is in the Septuagint.

Matt. xxii. 1-14.—In this parable of the Marriage of the King's Son, the *δοῦλοι* who summon the bidden guests (ver. 3, 4), and the *διάκονοι* who in the end expel the unworthy intruder (ver. 13), should not have been

confounded under the common name of 'servants.' A real and important distinction between the several actors in the parable is in this way obliterated. The δοῦλοι are *men*, the ambassadors of Christ, those that invite their fellow-men to the blessings of the kingdom of heaven; but the διάκονοι are *angels*, those that "stand by" (Luke xix. 24), ready to fulfil the divine judgments, and whom we ever find the executors of these judgments in the day of Christ's appearing. They are as distinct from one another as the "servants of the householder," who in like manner are men, and the 'reapers,' who are angels, in the parable of the Tares (Matt. xiii. 27, 30). The distinction which we have lost, the Vulgate has preserved; the δοῦλοι are 'servi,' the διάκονοι 'ministri;' and all our early translations in like manner rendered the words severally by 'servants' and 'ministers;' the Rheims by 'servants' and 'waiters.'[2]

There is a very real distinction between ἀπιστία and

[2] The remarkable fact that δοῦλος is never rendered 'slave' in our Version, that a word apparently of such prime necessity as 'slave' only occurs twice in the whole English Bible,—once in the Old Testament (Jer. ii. 14), and once in the New (Rev. xviii. 13, for σώματα), must be explained in part by the comparative newness of the word in our language (Gascoigne is the earliest authority for it which our Dictionaries give). This, however, would not of itself be sufficient to account for it; in the presence of the frequent employment of 'slave' in the cotemporary writings of Shakespeare. The reason lies deeper. In the ancient world, where almost all service was slavery, there was no opprobrium, no ethical contempt tinging the word δοῦλος. It is otherwise with 'slave' in that modern world where slavery and liberty exist side by side, where it is felt that no man ought to be a slave, that no *very* brave man would be; that the service which the slave renders is rendered not for conscience sake, but of compulsion. It is impossible to dissociate the word now from

ἀπείθεια. It is often urged by our elder divines; as by Jackson in more passages than one; but it is not constantly observed by our Translators. *Ἀπιστία* is, I believe, always and rightly rendered, 'unbelief,' while *ἀπείθεια* is in most cases rendered, and rightly, 'disobedience;' perhaps 'contumacy' would still better have expressed the positive active character which in it is implied; but on two occasions (Heb. iv. 6, 11) it also is translated 'unbelief.' In like manner, *ἀπιστεῖν* is properly "to refuse *belief*," *ἀπειθεῖν* "to refuse *obedience*;" but *ἀπειθεῖν* is often in our Translation allowed to run into the sense of *ἀπιστεῖν*, as at John iii. 36; Acts xiv. 2; xix. 9; Rom. xi. 30 (the right translation in the margin); and yet, as I have said, the distinction is real; *ἀπείθεια* or 'disobedience' is the result of *ἀπιστία* or 'unbelief;' they are not identical with one another.

Again, there was no possible reason why *σοφός* and *φρόνιμος* should not have been kept asunder, and the real distinction which exists between them in the original, maintained also in our Version. We possess 'wise' for *σοφός*, and 'prudent' for *φρόνιμος*. It is true that *συνετός* has taken possession of 'prudent,' but might have better been rendered by 'understanding.' Our Translators have thrown away their advantage here, rendering, I believe in every case, both *σοφός* and *φρόνιμος* by 'wise,' although in no single instance are the words interchangeable. The *φρόνιμος* is one who dexterously adapts his means to his ends (Luke xvi. 8), the word expressing nothing in respect of the ends themselves, whether they are

---

something of contempt. "Paul, the *slave* of Jesus Christ," literally accurate, would in fact have said something very different from Παῦλος, δοῦλος Ἰησοῦ Χριστοῦ.

worthy or not; the σοφός is one whose means and ends are alike worthy. God is σοφός (Jude 25); wicked men may be φρόνιμοι, while σοφοί, except in the σοφία τοῦ κόσμου, which is itself an ironical term, they could never be. How much would have been gained at Luke xvi. 8, if φρονίμως had been rendered not 'wisely,' but 'prudently;' how much needless offence would have been avoided!

The standing word which St. Paul uses to express the forgiveness of sins is ἄφεσις ἁμαρτιῶν; but on one remarkable occasion he changes his word, and instead of ἄφεσις employs πάρεσις (Rom. iii. 25). Our Translators take no note of the very noticeable substitution, but render πάρεσιν ἁμαρτιῶν, or rather here ἁμαρτημάτων, "*remission* of sins," as every where else they have rendered the more usual phrase. But it was not for nothing that St. Paul used here quite another word. He is speaking of quite a different thing; he is speaking not of the 'remission' of sins, or the letting of them quite go, but of the 'pretermission' (πάρεσις from παρίημι), the passing of them by on the part of God for a while, the temporary dissimulation upon his part, which found place under the old covenant, in consideration of the great sacrifice which was one day to be. The passage is further obscured by the fact that our Translators have rendered διὰ τὴν πάρεσιν as though it had been διὰ τῆς παρέσεως—"*for* the remission," that is, with a view to the remission, while the proper rendering of διά, with an accusative, would of course have been "*because of* the remission," or better "the pretermission," or, as Hammond proposes, "because of *the passing by*, of past sins." What the Apostle would say is this: "There needed a signal manifestation of the righteousness of God on account of the long pretermission,

or passing by, of sins in his infinite forbearance, with no adequate expression of his righteous wrath against them, during all those ages which preceded the revelation of Christ: which manifestation of his righteousness at length found place, when He set forth no other and no less than his own Son to be the propitiatory sacrifice for sin." But the passage, as we have it now, cannot be said to yield this meaning.

There are two occasions on which a multitude is miraculously fed by our Lord; and it is not a little remarkable that on the first occasion in every narrative, and there are four records of the miracle, the word κόφινος is used of the baskets in which the fragments which remain are gathered up (Matt. xiv. 20; Mark vi. 43; Luke ix. 17; John vi. 13), while on occasion of the second miracle, in the two records which are all that we have of it, σπυρίς is used (Matt. xv. 37; Mark viii. 8); and in proof that this is not accidental see Matt. xvi. 9, 10; Mark viii. 19, 20. The fact is a slight, yet not unimportant, testimony to the entire distinctness of the two miracles, and that we have not here, as some of the modern assailants of the historical accuracy of the Gospels assure us, two confused traditions of one and the same event. What the exact distinction between κόφινος and σπυρίς is, may be hard to determine, and it may not be very easy to suggest what second word should have marked this distinction; for 'maunds' is now obsolete, and a 'canister' is not a basket any longer; yet I cannot but think that where, not merely the Evangelists in their narrative, but the Lord in his allusion to the event so distinctly marks a difference, we should have attempted to mark it also, as the Vulgate by 'cophini' and 'sportæ' has done.

Again, our Translators obliterate, for the most part, the distinction between παῖς Θεοῦ and υἱὸς Θεοῦ, as applied to Christ. There are five passages in the New Testament in which the title παῖς Θεοῦ is given to the Son of God. In the first of these (Matt. xii. 18) they have rendered παῖς by 'servant;' and they would have done well if they had abode by this in the other four. These all occur in the Acts, and in every one of them the notion of 'servant' is abandoned, and 'son' (Acts iii. 13, 26), or 'child' (Acts iv. 27, 30), introduced. I cannot but feel that in this they were in error. Παῖς Θεοῦ might be rendered "servant of God," and I am persuaded that it ought. It might be, for it needs not to say παῖς is continually used like the Latin 'puer' in the sense of servant, and in the LXX. παῖς Θεοῦ as the "servant of God:" David calls himself so no less than seven times in 2 Sam. vii.; cf. Luke i. 69; Acts iv. 25; Job i. 8; Ps. xix. 12, 14. But not merely it might have been thus rendered; it also should have been, as these reasons convince me:—Every student of prophecy must have noticed how much there is in Isaiah prophesying of Christ under the aspect of "the *servant* of the Lord;" "Israel my *servant*;" "my *servant* whom I uphold" (Isa. xlii. 1-7; xlix. 1-12; lii. 13; liii. 12). I say, prophesying of Christ; for I dismiss, as a baseless dream of those who *à priori* are determined that there are, and therefore shall be, no prophecies in Scripture, the notion that "the servant of Jehovah" in Isaiah is Israel according to the flesh, or Isaiah himself, or the body of the prophets collectively considered, or any other except Christ Himself. But it is quite certain from the inner harmonies of the Old Testament and the New, that wherever there is a large group of prophecies in the Old, there is some allusion to them in the New.

Unless, however, we render παῖς Θεοῦ by "servant of God" in the places where that phrase occurs in the New, there will be no allusion throughout it all to that group of prophecies, which designate the Messiah as the servant of Jehovah, who learned obedience by the things which He suffered. I cannot doubt, and, as far as I know, this is the conclusion of all who have considered the subject, that παῖς Θεοῦ should be rendered "servant of God," as often as in the New Testament it is used of Christ. His *Sonship* will remain sufficiently declared in innumerable other passages.

Something of precision and beauty is lost at John x. 16, through a rendering of αὐλή and ποίμνη both by 'fold:' "And other sheep I have, which are not of this *fold* (αὐλῆς); these also I must bring, and they shall hear my voice; and there shall be one *fold* (ποίμνη), and one shepherd." It is remarkable that in the Vulgate there is the same obliteration of the distinction between the two words, 'ovile' standing for both. Substitute 'flock' for 'fold' on the second occasion of its occurring (this was Tyndale's rendering, which we should not have forsaken), and it will be at once felt how much the verse will gain. The Jew and the Gentile are the two 'folds,' which Christ, the Good Shepherd, will gather into a single 'flock.'

As a farther example take John xvii. 12: "While I was with them in the world, I *kept* them in thy name. Those that Thou gavest me I have *kept*, and none of them is lost." It is not a great matter; yet who would not gather from this 'kept' recurring twice in this verse, that there must be also in the original some word of the like recurrence? Yet it is not so; the first 'kept' is ἐτήρουν, and the second ἐφύλαξα: nor are τηρεῖν and

φυλάσσειν here such mere synonyms, that the distinction between them may be effaced without loss. The first is 'servare,' or better, 'conservare,' the second 'custodire;' and the first, the keeping or preserving, is the consequence of the second, the guarding. What the Lord would say is: "I so guarded, so protected (ἐφύλαξα), those whom Thou hast given me, that I kept and preserved them (this the τήρησις) unto the present day." Thus Lampe: "τηρεῖν est generalius, vitæque novæ *finalem* conservationem potest exprimere; φυλάσσειν vero specialius *mediorum* præstationem, per quæ finis ille obtinetur;" and he proceeds to quote, excellently to the point, Prov. xix. 6: ὃς φυλάσσει ἐντολὴν, τηρεῖ τὴν ἑαυτοῦ ψυχήν.

Before leaving this branch of the subject, I will give a few examples more of the way in which a single word in the English does duty for many in the Greek. 'To ordain' stands for all these words: καθίστημι (Tit. i. 5); ὁρίζω (Acts x. 42); ποιέω (Mark iii. 14); τάσσω (Acts xiii. 48); τίθημι (John xv. 16); χειροτονέω (Acts xiv. 23). Again, we are tempted to ask, without always being able, even while we ask the question, to offer a satisfactory answer to it, might not something have been done to distinguish between ἀναστροφή (Gal. i. 13), τρόπος (Heb. xiii. 5), πολίτευμα (Phil. iii. 20), all rendered 'conversation;' between φονεύς (1 Pet. iv. 15), σικάριος (Acts xxi. 38), ἀνθρωποκτόνος (1 John iii. 15), all rendered 'murderer;' between δίκτυον (Matt. iv. 20), ἀμφίβληστρον (Matt. iv. 18), and σαγήνη (Matt. xiii. 47), all translated 'net'? Or take the words, 'thought' and 'to think.' The Biblical psychology is anyhow a subject encumbered with most serious perplexities. He finds it so, and often sees his way but obscurely, who has all the helps which the most accurate observation and compari-

son of the terms actually used by the sacred writers will afford. Of course none but the student of the original document can have these helps in their fulness; at the same time it scarcely needed that 'thought' should be employed as the rendering alike of ἐνθύμησις (Matt. ix. 4), διαλογισμός (Matt. xv. 19), διανόημα (Luke xi. 17), ἐπίνοια (Acts viii. 22), λογισμός (Rom. ii. 15), and νόημα (2 Cor. x. 5); or that the verb 'to think' should in the passages which follow be the one English representative of a still wider circle of words, of δοκέω (Matt. iii. 9), νομίζω (Matt. v. 17), ἐνθυμέομαι (Matt. ix. 4), διαλογίζομαι (Luke xii. 17), διενθυμέομαι (Acts x. 19), ὑπονοέω (Acts xiii. 25), ἡγέομαι (Acts xxvi. 2), κρίνω (Acts xxvi. 8), φρονέω (Rom. xii. 3), λογίζομαι (2 Cor. iii. 5), νοέω (Eph. iii. 20), οἴομαι (Jam. i. 7).[3]

One example more. The verb 'to trouble' is a very favourite one with our Translators. There are no less than ten Greek words or phrases, which it is employed by them to render; these namely: κόπους παρέχω (Matt. xxvi. 10), σκύλλω (Mark v. 35), διαταράσσω (Luke i. 29), τυρβάζω (Luke x. 41), παρενοχλέω (Acts xv. 19), θορυβέομαι (Acts xx. 10), ταράσσω (Gal. i. 7), ἀναστατόω (Gal. v. 12), θλίβω (2 Thess. i. 6), ἐνοχλέω (Heb. xii. 15). If we add to these ἐκταράσσω, "exceedingly to trouble" (Acts xvi. 20), θροέομαι, "to be troubled" (Matt. xxiv. 6), the word will do duty for no fewer than twelve Greek words. Now, the English language may not be so rich in synonyms as the Greek; but with 'vex,' 'harass,' 'annoy,' 'disturb,' 'distress,' 'afflict,' 'disquiet,' 'unsettle,'

[3] For the distinction between some at least of these, a distinction which it would be quite possible to reproduce in English, see Vömel, *Synon. Wörterbuch*, p. 131, s.v. 'glauben.'

'burden,' 'terrify,' almost every one of which would in one of the above places or other seem to me more appropriate than the word actually employed, I cannot admit that the poverty or limited resources of our language left no choice here but to efface all the distinctions between these words, as by the employment of 'trouble' for them all has, in these cases at least, been done.

CHAPTER VII.

ON SOME BETTER RENDERINGS FORSAKEN, OR PLACED IN THE MARGIN.

OCCASIONALLY, but rarely, our Translators dismiss a better rendering, which was in one or more of the earlier versions, and replace it by a worse. It may be said of their Version, in comparison with those which went before, that it occupies very much the place which the Vulgate did in regard of the Latin versions preceding. In the whole, an immense improvement, while yet in some minor details they are more accurate than it. This is so in the passages which follow.

Matt. xxviii. 14.—"And if this *come to the governor's ears*, we will persuade him, and secure you." The Geneva version, but that alone among the previous ones,[1] had given

---

[1] It is evident that there must have been some very good and careful scholarship brought to bear on this version, or revision rather. I have observed, on several occasions, that it is the first to seize the exact meaning of a passage, which all the preceding versions had missed. I will adduce, in a note, three or four occasions which present themselves to me where this has been the case.

Mark xiv. 72.—Καὶ ἐπιβαλὼν ἔκλαιε. All versions, from Wiclif to Cranmer inclusive, "And began to weep," a rendering which even our Authorized Version has allowed in the margin. But the Geneva rightly, "And *weighing that with himself* (ἐπιβαλών, that is, τὸν νοῦν), he wept." Our Version is indeed better, "And *when he thought*

the passage rightly: "And if this *come before the governor* (*καὶ ἐὰν ἀκουσθῇ τοῦτο ἐπὶ τοῦ ἡγεμόνος*), we will pacify

---

thereon, he wept;" but the Geneva is correct, and the first which is so.

Luke xi. 17.—Καὶ οἶκος ἐπὶ οἶκον, πίπτει. Tyndale had it, "And one house shall fall upon another;" Cranmer and Coverdale the same. Even to this present day there are those who maintain this version,—Meyer, for instance, with that singular perversity which amid his eminent exegetical tact he contrives sometimes to display, —making this not an independent clause and thought, but merely a drawing out more at large the ἐρήμωσις of the βασιλεία, just before spoken of. But the Geneva rightly, assuming a comma after οἶκον, and drawing a διαμερισθείς from the preceding clause into this, "And a house divided against itself, falleth:" cf. Matt. xii. 35.

Acts xxiii. 27.—Ἐξειλόμην αὐτὸν, μαθὼν ὅτι Ῥωμαῖος ἔστιν. Here too the Geneva is the first which brings out the characteristic untruth of which Lysias, who otherwise recommends himself favourably to us, is guilty in his letter to Felix. Wishing to obtain credit with his superior officer, to set his own zeal in the most favourable light, he contrives, by a slight shifting of the order of events, to make it appear that he rescued Paul out of the hands of the fanatic Jewish populace, "*having understood* that he was a Roman;" when indeed he only discovered the citizenship of Paul at a later period (cf. xxi. 32, 33, and xxii. 27), and not until he had grossly outraged the majesty of Rome in him, all mention of which he naturally suppresses. The earlier Anglican versions had it, "Then came I with soldiers and rescued him, *and perceived* that he was a Roman;" as though, which was indeed the fact, but not what he would present as the fact, he had perceived this after the rescue; but the Geneva rightly, "*perceiving* that he was Roman,"—not the truth, but what he would present as the truth. The attempt of Grotius to make μαθὼν here= καὶ ἔμαθον must be decidedly rejected; see Winer, *Gramm.* § 46.

Acts xxvii. 9.—Διὰ τὸ καὶ τὴν νηστείαν ἤδη παρεληλυθέναι. None of our earlier translators appear to have been aware that ἡ νηστεία was a name by which the great fast of the Atonement, being the only fast specially commanded in the Jewish ritual (Lev. xvi. 29; xxiii. 27), was technically known; see Philo, *de Septen.* § 2. We may

him, and save you harmless." The words of the original have reference to a judicial hearing of the matter before the governor ("si res apud illum judicem agatur," Erasmus), and not to the possibility of its reaching his ears by hearsay; but this our Translation fails to express. In πείσομεν, I may observe, lies a euphemism by no means rare in Hellenistic Greek (see Krebs, *Obss. e Josepho*, in loco): "We will take effectual means to persuade him;" as, knowing the covetous greedy character of the man, they were able confidently to promise.

Mark xi. 17.—"Is it not written, My house shall be called *of all nations* the house of prayer? but ye have made it a den of thieves." In Tyndale's version, in Cranmer's, and the Geneva: "My house shall be called the house of prayer *unto all nations;* but ye, &c." and rightly. There is no difficulty whatever in giving πᾶσι τοῖς ἔθνεσι, a dative rather than an ablative sense; while thus the passage is brought into exact agreement with that in Isaiah, to which Christ, in his "Is it not written?" refers, namely, Isa. lvi. 7; and moreover, the point of his words is preserved, which the present translation misses. Our Lord's

---

see from Tyndale's words, "because also we had overlong fasted," how utterly astray they would be, in consequence of this ignorance, as regards the meaning of this passage. But the Geneva rightly, "because also the time of the fast was now passed."

Jam. i. 13.—Ὁ γὰρ Θεὸς ἀπείραστός ἐστι κακῶν. All the translations which had gone before, from Wiclif to Cranmer, giving to ἀπείραστος an active signification, which it certainly might have, but has not here, had made this clause a mere tautology to that which follows. Thus Tyndale: "For God *tempteth not unto evil*, neither tempteth He any man." The Geneva first ascribed to ἀπείραστος its proper passive force (see Winer, *Gramm.* § 30. 4), translating in words which our Version has retained, "For God *cannot be tempted with evil*, neither tempteth He any man."

indignation was aroused in part at the profanation of the holy precincts of his Father's house; but in part, also, by the fact, that the scene of this profanation being the Court of the Gentiles, the Jews have thus managed to testify their contempt for them, and for their share in the blessings of the Covenant. Those parts of the temple which were exclusively their own, the Court of the Priests, and the Court of the Israelites, they had kept clear of these buyers and sellers; but that part assigned to the Gentile worshippers, the σεβόμενοι τὸν Θεόν, they were little concerned about the profanation to which it was exposed, perhaps pleased with it rather. But He who came into the world to be a Redeemer, not of Jews only, but also of Gentiles, quotes in a righteous indignation the words of the prophet, which they had done all that in them lay to irritate and defeat: "My house shall be called the house of prayer *unto all nations*:" all which intention on his part in the citation of the prophecy our Version fails to preserve. Mede, in an interesting discourse upon the text,[2] ascribes to the influence of Beza this alteration, which is certainly one for the worse.

Luke xvi. 1.—"The same was accused unto him *that he had wasted* his goods." The Geneva had corrected this, which was in Tyndale and Cranmer, and given to ὡς διασκορπίζων its proper sense, "*that he wasted*," the accusation referring not to what the steward had done, but now was doing.

Acts xxi. 3.—"For there the ship *was to unlade* her burden." This, supported though it be by Valckenaer ("eo navis merces *expositura erat*") and others, is incorrect. There can no such future sense be given to ἦν ἀποφορ-

[2] *Works*, London, 1672, p. 44; cf. p. 11.

τιζόμενον; see Winer, *Gramm.* § 46. 5. St. Luke would say, "was unlading," or "was engaged in unlading;" and Tyndale rightly, whom Cranmer and the Geneva follow: "For there the ship *unladed* her burden." He is speaking from a point of view taken after the ship's arrival at this place, and of what it actually did, not of what it should do.

Ephes. iv. 18.—"Because of the *blindness* of their hearts." The Geneva version had given this rightly: "because of the *hardness* of their heart;" which better rendering our Translators forsake, being content to place it in the margin. But there can be no doubt that πώρωσις is from the substantive πῶρος, a porous kind of stone, and from πωρόω, to become callous, hard, or stony (Mark vi. 52; John xii. 40; Rom. xi. 7; 2 Cor. iii. 14); not from πωρός, blind. How much better, too, this agrees with what follows—"who being *past feeling*" (that is, having through their hardness or callousness of heart, arrived at a condition of miserable ἀναισθησία) "have given themselves over to work all uncleanness with greediness." I may observe that at Rom. xi. 7, they have in like manner put 'blinded' in the text, and 'hardened,' the correct rendering of ἐπωρώθησαν, in the margin; while at 2 Cor. iii. 14, where they translate ἀλλ' ἐπωρώθη τὰ νοήματα αὐτῶν, "but their minds *were blinded*," the correcter is not even offered as an alternative rendering. Wiclif and the Rheims, which both depend on the Vulgate ("sed *obtusi sunt* sensus eorum"), are here the only correct versions.

1 Thess. v. 22.—"Abstain from all *appearance* of evil." An injurious rendering of the words, ἀπὸ παντὸς εἴδους πονηροῦ ἀπέχεσθε, and a going back from the right translation, "Abstain from all *kind* of evil," which the Geneva version had. It is from the *reality* of evil, and

εἶδος here means this (see a good note in Hammond), not from the *appearance,* which God's Word elsewhere commands us to abstain; nor does it here command any other thing.[3] Indeed there are times when, so far from abstaining from all *appearance* of evil, it will be a part of Christian courage *not* to abstain from such. It was an "*appearance* of evil" in the eyes of the Pharisees, when our Lord healed on the Sabbath, or showed Himself a friend of publicans and sinners; but Christ did not therefore abstain from this or from that. How many "appearances of evil," which he might have abstained from, yet did not, must St. Paul's own conversation have presented in the eyes of the zealots for the ceremonial law. I was once inclined to think that our Translators used 'appearance' here as we might now use 'form,' and that we therefore had here an obsolete, not an inaccurate, rendering; but I can find no authority for this use of the word.

1 Tim. vi. 5.—"Supposing *that gain is godliness.*" It is difficult to connect any meaning whatever with this language. But Coverdale, and he alone of our Translators, deals with these words, *νομιζόντων πορισμὸν εἶναι τὴν εὐσέβειαν,* rightly,—"which think *that godliness is lucre,*" *i. e.* a means of gain. The want of a thorough mastery of the Greek article and its use, left it possible here to go back from a right rendering once attained.

Heb. ix. 23.—"It was therefore necessary that *the patterns* of things in the heavens should be purified with these, but the heavenly things themselves with better sacri-

[3] Jeanes, chiefly remembered now for his theological controversy with Jeremy Taylor, in which the greater man had not always the best of the argument, in a treatise of some merit, *Concerning Abstinence from all Appearance of Evil* (*Works*, 1660, pp. 68 *sqq.*), defends our present version of the words.

fices than these." 'Patterns' introduces some confusion here, and is not justified by the word's use in the time of our Translators, any more than in our own. It is, of course, quite true that *ὑπόδειγμα* may mean, and, indeed, often does mean, 'pattern' or 'exemplar' (John xiii. 15). But here, as at viii. 5 (*ὑπόδειγμα καὶ σκία*), it can only mean the 'copy' drawn from this exemplar. The heavenly things themselves are 'the patterns' or archetypes, the 'Urbilden;' the earthly, the Levitical tabernacle with its priests and sacrifices, are the copies, the similitudes, the 'Abbilden,' which, as such, are partakers not of a real, but a typical, purification. This is, indeed, the very point which the Apostle is urging, and his whole antithesis is confused by calling the earthly things 'the patterns,' being as they are, only the shadows of the true. The earlier translators, Tyndale, Cranmer, and the Geneva, had 'similitudes,' which was correct, though it seems to me that 'copies' would be preferable.[4]

Heb. xi. 13.—"These all died in faith; not having received the promises; but having seen them afar off, and were persuaded of them, and *embraced* them." But with all respect be it said, this "*embracing* the promises" was the very thing which the worthies of the Old Testament did not do; and which the sacred writer is urging throughout that they did not do, who only saw them from

[4] It is familiarly known to all students of English that 'pattern' is originally only another spelling of 'patron' (the client imitates his *patron;* the copy takes after its *pattern*), however they may have now separated off into two words. But it is interesting to notice the word when as yet this separation of one into two had not uttered itself in different orthography. We do this Heb. viii. 5 (Geneva Version): "which priestes serve unto the *patrone* and shadow of heavenly things."

afar, as things distant and not near. Our present rendering is an unfortunate going back from Tyndale's and Cranmer's, "saluted them," from Wiclif's "greeted them." The beautiful image of mariners homeward-bound, who recognize from afar the promontories and well-known features of a beloved land, and 'greet' or 'salute' these from a distance, is lost to us. Estius: "Chrysostomus dictum putat ex metaphorâ navigantium qui ex longinquo prospiciunt civitates desideratas, quas antequam ingrediantur et inhabitent, salutatione præveniunt." Cf. Virgil, *Æn.* iii. 524:

"Italiam læto socii clamore *salutant*."

In other respects our Version is unsatisfactory. The words, "and were persuaded of them," have no right to a place in the text; while the "afar off" (πόρρωθεν) belongs not to the seeing alone, but to the saluting as well. How beautifully the verse would read thus amended: "These all died in faith; not having received the promises, but having seen and saluted them from afar." We have exactly such a salutation from afar in the words of the dying Jacob: "I have waited for thy salvation, O Lord" (Gen. xlix. 18).

1 Pet. i. 17.—"And if *ye call on the Father*, who without respect of persons judgeth according to every man's work, pass the time of your sojourning here in fear." Here, too, it must be confessed, that we have left a better and chosen a worse rendering. The Geneva had it, "And if *ye call Him Father*, who without respect of persons, &c.," and this, and this only, is the meaning which the words of the original, καὶ εἰ Πατέρα ἐπικαλεῖσθε τὸν ἀπροσωποληπτως κρίνοντα, κ.τ.λ., will bear.

It must not be supposed from what has been here adduced that our Translators did not exercise a very care-

ful revision of the translations preceding. In every page of their work there is evidence that they did so. Of many passages our Authorized Version is the first that has seized the true meaning. It would be easy for me to bring forward many proofs of this, only that my task is here, passing over the hundred excellencies, to fasten rather on the single fault; and I must therefore content myself with just sufficient to confirm my assertion. Thus at Heb. iv. 1, none of the preceding versions, neither the Anglican, nor the Rheims, had correctly given *καταλειπομένης ἐπαγγελίας*: they all translate it, "forsaking the promise," or something similar, instead of, as we have rightly done, "a promise being left us." Again, at Acts xii. 19, the technical meaning of *ἀπαχθῆναι* (like the Latin 'duci,' 'agi'), that it signifies here to be "led away *to execution*" (cf. Demosthenes, 431. 7), is wholly missed by Tyndale ("he examined the keepers and commanded *to depart*"), by Cranmer and the Rheims; it is only partially seized by the Geneva version ("commanded them to be led *to be punished*"), but perfectly by our Translators. Far more important than this is the clear recognition of the personality of the Word in the prologue of St. John by our Translators: "All things were made by *Him*;" "In *Him* was life" (John i. 3, 4); while in all our preceding versions it is read, "All things were made by *it*," and so on. Our Version is the first which gives *συναλιζόμενος* (Acts i. 4) rightly.

Improvements also are very frequent in single words and phrases, even where those which are displaced were not absolutely incorrect. Thus how much better "earnest expectation" (Rom. viii. 19) than "fervent desire," as a rendering of *ἀποκαραδοκία*; "moved with envy" (Acts vii. 9) than "having indignation" of *ζηλώσαντες*; 'tattlers'

than 'triflers,' as a rendering of φλύαροι (1 Tim. v. 13); indeed the latter could hardly be said to be correct.[5] How much better, "being *gotten* from them" than, "being *parted* from them" (Acts xxi. 1), for it expresses, perhaps even it too weakly (ἀποσπασθέντας is the word in the original), the painful struggle with which this separation was effected; of which there is no hint in the versions preceding. "*Whited* sepulchres" is an improvement upon "*painted* sepulchres" (τάφοι κεκονιαμένοι, Matt. xxiii. 27), which all our preceding versions had. "Without *distraction*" (1 Cor. vii. 35) is a far better rendering of ἀπερισπάστως than "without *separation*." 'Leopard' is better than "cat of the mountain," Rev. xiii. 2 (it is πάρδαλις in the original). 'Mysteries,' *i. e.* "*religious* secrets," is much to be preferred to 'secrets,' which all our preceding Anglican versions had, often, though not always, where the word μυστήριον occurred (Matt. xiii. 11; Rom. xi. 25; 1 Cor. xiii. 2). 'Be opened' or 'be disclosed,' with which all that went before rendered ἀποκαλυφθῇ (2 Thess. ii. 3),—and compare ver. 8, "be uttered,"—quite obscured the terrible signification of the *revelation* of the Man of Sin, which the Apostle sets over against the revelation of the Son of God. It was slovenly to introduce 'Candy,' the modern name of Crete, which all before our own had done, at Acts xxvii. 7, 12, 21; but which in ours is removed; and not less slovenly to confound 'Nazarite' and 'Nazarene,' substituting the former for the latter, an error into which in like manner they all, at Matt. ii. 23 and Acts xxiv. 5,

[5] Unless, indeed, 'trifler' once meant "utterer of trifles," and thus 'tattler;' which may perhaps be, as I observe in the fragment of a *Nominale* published by Wright, *National Antiquities*, vol. i. p. 216, 'nugigerulus' given as the Latin equivalent of 'trifler.'

had fallen, introducing, in the former of these places at least, a new element of difficulty into a passage sufficiently difficult already.

But this going back from preferable renderings already attained, is not all. There are better translations, derived either from the labours of their predecessors, or suggested to themselves, which, provokingly enough, they half adopt, placing them in the margin, while they satisfy themselves with a worse in the text. It may perhaps be urged that here at least they offer the better to the reader's choice. But practically this cannot be said to be the case. For, in the first place, the proportion of our Bibles is very small even now which are printed with these marginal variations, as compared with those in which they are suppressed. At one time it was smaller still; from some words of Hammond, in the advertisement to his New Testament, it would seem they had entirely dropt out of use in his time,—he speaks there of "the manner which was formerly used in our Bibles of the larger impression, of noting some other renderings in the margin." They are thus brought under the notice of very few among the readers of Scripture. Nor is this all. They are very rarely referred to even by these. How many, for instance, among these even know of the existence of a variation so important as that at John iii. 3? And even if they do refer, they generally attach comparatively little authority to them. They acquiesce for the most part, and naturally acquiesce, in the verdict of the Translators about them; who, by placing them in the margin, and not in the text, evidently declare that they consider them not the best, but the second best and the less probable renderings. Then too, of course, they are never heard in the public services

of the Church, which, till the Scriptures are far more diligently studied in private than now they are, must always be a chief source of the popular acquaintance with them. It is impossible, then, to attach to a right interpretation in the margin any serious value, as redressing an erroneous or imperfect one in the text. Marginal variations are quite without influence as modifying the impression which the body of English readers derive of any passages in the English Bible; and this leads me to observe, by the way, that the suggestion which has been sometimes made of a large addition to these, as a middle way and compromise between leaving our Version as it is, and introducing actual changes into its text, does not seem to me to open any real escape from our difficulties, nor to offer any practical reconciliation of their wishes who claim and theirs who disclaim a revision; while the objections which would attend it are many.

But to return. The following are passages in which I cannot doubt that the better version has been placed in the margin, the worse in the text.

Matt. v. 21; cf. ver. 27, 33.—"Ye have heard that it was said *by them* of old time." This rendering of ἐῤῥέθη τοῖς ἀρχαίοις is grammatically defensible, while yet there can be no reasonable doubt that "*to them* of old time," which was in all the preceding versions, but which our Translators have dismissed to the margin, ought to resume its place in the text. The four following passages, Rom. ix. 12, 26; Rev. vi. 11; ix. 4, are decisive in regard of the usage of the New Testament, and that we have here a dative, not an ablative.

Matt. ix. 36.—"They fainted and *were scattered abroad,* as sheep having no shepherd." But "scattered abroad" does not exactly express ἐῤῥιμμένοι, any more than

does the Luther's 'zerstreut.' It is not their *dispersion* one from another, but their *prostration* in themselves, which is intended. The ἐῤῥιμμένοι are the 'prostrati,' "temere projecti;" those that have cast themselves along for very weariness, unable to travel any farther; cf. Judith xiv. 15, LXX. The Vulgate has it rightly, 'jacentes,' which Wiclif follows, "lying down." Our present rendering dates as far back as Tyndale, who probably got it from Luther, and it was retained in the subsequent versions; while the correct meaning is relegated to the margin.

Matt. x. 16.—"Be ye therefore wise as serpents, and *harmless* as doves." Wiclif, following the Vulgate, had "*simple* as doves." 'Simple' our Translators have dismissed to the margin; they ought to have kept it in the text, as rightly they have done at Rom. xvi. 19. The rendering of ἀκέραιος by 'harmless' here and at Phil. ii. 15, grows out of wrong etymology, as though it were from ἀ and κέρας, one having no horn with which to push or otherwise hurt. Thus Bengel, who falls in with this error, glosses here: "*Sine cornu*, ungulâ, dente, aculeo." But this "without horn" would be ἀκέρατος; while the true derivation of ἀκέραιος, it need hardly be said, is from ἀ and κεράννυμι, unmingled, sincere, and thus single, guileless, simple, without all folds. How much finer the antithesis in this way becomes. "Be ye therefore wise" ('prudent' would be better) "as serpents, and *simple* as doves,"[6] —having care, that is, that this prudence of yours do not degenerate into artifice and guile; letting the columbine

[6] It is worthy of notice that Jeremy Taylor's great sermons on this text are severally entitled, "Of Christian *Prudence*," and "Of Christian *Simplicity*,"—a quiet rectification of the English text in the sense which is urged above.

simplicity go hand in hand with the serpentine prudence. The exact parallel will then be 1 Cor. xiv. 20.

Mark vi. 20.—"For Herod feared John, knowing that he was a just man and an holy, *and observed him.*" This may be after Erasmus, who renders *καὶ συνετήρει αὐτόν*, "et magni eum faciebat;" so too Grotius and others. Now it is undoubtedly true that *συντηρεῖν τὰ δίκαια* (Polybius, iv. 60, 10) would be rightly translated "to observe things righteous;" but here it is not things, but a person, and no such rendering is admissible. Translate rather, as in our margin, "kept him or saved him," that is, from the malice of Herodias; she laid plots for the Baptist's life, but up to this time Herod *συνετήρει*, sheltered or preserved him ("custodiebat eum," the Vulgate rightly), so that her malice could not reach him; see Hammond, *in loco*. It will at once be evident in how much stricter logical sequence the statement of the Evangelist will follow, if this rendering of the passage is admitted.

Mark vii. 4.—"The washing of cups and pots, brasen vessels, and of *tables*." This cannot be correct: our Translators have put 'beds' in the margin, against which rendering of *κλινῶν* nothing can be urged, except that the context points clearly here to these in a special aspect, namely, to the 'benches' or 'couches' on which the Jews reclined at their meals.

Luke xvii. 21.—"The kingdom of heaven is *within you*." Doubtless, *ἐντὸς ὑμῶν may* mean this; but how could the Lord address this language *to the Pharisees?* A very different kingdom from the kingdom of heaven was *within them*, not to say that this whole language of the kingdom of heaven being within men, rather than men being within the kingdom of heaven, is, as one has justly observed, modern. The marginal reading, "among you,"

should have been the textual. "He in whom the whole kingdom of heaven is shut up as in a germ, and from whom it will unfold itself, *stands in your midst.*"

John xiv. 18.—"I will not leave you *comfortless.*" Upon these words Archdeacon Hare observes: "What led our Translators, from Tyndale downwards, to render *οὐκ ἀφήσω ὑμᾶς ὀρφανούς* by 'I will not leave you *comfortless,*' I cannot perceive. Wiclif has 'fadirless.' 'Orphans,' the marginal reading, ought to have been received into the text, for the force and beauty of the original are much impaired by the change."[7] If there was a difficulty working in their minds, namely, how *his* departure could be said to leave them 'orphans' or '*fatherless,*' He being rather "the first-born among many *brethren,*" there was 'destitute' and 'desolate,' either of which would have been nearer to the original than 'comfortless' is.

John xvi. 8.—"And when He is come, He will *reprove* the world of sin, and of righteousness, and of judgment." We have, perhaps, no where in our Version more reason to regret than here that the marginal reading 'convince' has not changed places with the textual 'reprove'—that 'convince' is not in the text, and 'reprove,' if it had been thought desirable to retain it at all, in the margin. It need hardly be observed what a depth of meaning there is, or may be, in *ἐλέγχειν*—and being ascribed to the Holy Ghost, we must not stop short of the fullest and deepest meaning that the word will bear,—how much more than is expressed by 'reprove.' It is not to 'reprove' alone, but to bring home to the conscience of the reproved man, however unwilling he may be to admit it, a sense of the truth of the charge; and all this, or nearly all this, our word 'convince' ex-

[7] *Mission of the Comforter*, p. 527.

presses, or might be brought to express. Samuel *reproved* Saul of sin (1 Sam. xv. 19, 20), Nathan *convinced* David (2 Sam. xii. 7-13), and, though less effectually, Elijah *convinced* Ahab (1 Kin. xxi. 27-29). How much more glorious a work this to ascribe to the Holy Ghost than that other! Indeed, it is properly his work and his only; no man has in the highest sense been *convinced* of sin, unless He has wrought the conviction.[8]

Col. ii. 18.—"Let no man *beguile you of your reward.*" It is evident that this καταβραβενέτω ὑμᾶς seriously perplexed all our early translators, and indeed others besides them. Thus in the Italic we find, "vos superet;" in the Vulgate, "vos decipiat;" Tyndale translates, "make you shoot at a wrong mark;" the Geneva, "wilfully bear rule over you;" while our Translators have proposed as an alternative reading to that which they admit into the text, "judge against you." The objection to this last, which marks more insight into the true character of the word than any which went before, is that it is too obscure, and does not sufficiently tell its own story. The meaning of βραβεύειν is, to adjudge a reward; of καταβραβεύειν, out of a hostile mind (this is implied in the κατά), to adjudge it away from a person, with the subaudition that this is the person to whom it is justly due. Jerome (*ad Algas. Qu.* 10) does not quite seize the meaning; for he regards the καταβραβεύων as the competitor who unjustly bears away, not the judge who unjustly ascribes, the reward: otherwise his explanation is good: "Nemo adversum vos bravium

[8] All familiar with Archdeacon Hare's *Mission of the Comforter*, will remember how much of excellent there is there upon this point in the text, pp. 35-40, and in the long and learned note, which is appended to the text, what there is more valuable still, pp. 528-544.

accipiat: hoc enim Græcè dicitur καταβραβευέτω, quum quis in certamine positus, iniquitate agonothetæ, vel insidiis magistrorum, βραβεῖον et palmam sibi debitam perdit." It is impossible for any English word to express the fulness of allusion contained in the original Greek; while long circumlocutions, which should turn the version in fact into a commentary, are clearly inadmissible. If "judge against you" is at once too obscure, and too little of an English idiom, and, "judge away the reward from you," might be objected against, on at least the second of these grounds, the substitution of 'deprive' for 'beguile' (which last has certainly no claim to stand) would, in case of a revision, be desirable.

1 Thess. iv. 6.—"Let no man go beyond or defraud his brother *in any matter*." But τῷ here is not = τῳ = τινι, which would alone justify the rendering of ἐν τῷ πράγματι, "in *any* matter." A more correct translation is in the margin, namely "in *the* matter," that is, "in *this* matter," being the matter with which the Apostle at the moment has to do. The difference may not seem very important, but, indeed, the whole sense of the passage turns on this word; and, as we translate in one way or the other, we determine for ourselves whether it is a warning against overreaching our neighbour, and a too shrewd dealing with him in the business transactions of life, strangely finding place in the midst of warnings against uncleanness and a libertine freedom in the relation of the sexes; or whether an unbroken warning against this latter evil is continued through all these verses (3-9). I cannot doubt that the latter is the correct view, that τὸ πρᾶγμα is an euphemism, and our marginal version the right one; the Apostle warning his Thessalonian converts that none, in a worse πλεονεξία than that which makes one man covet his

neighbour's goods, overstep the limits and fences by which God has hedged round and separated from him his brother's wife. See Bengel, *in loco*. Accepting this view of the passage, 'overreach,' which the margin suggests instead of 'defraud,' as the rendering of πλεονεκτεῖν, would also be an undoubted improvement.

Heb. v. 2.—"Who *can have compassion on* the ignorant, and on them that are out of the way, for that he himself also is compassed with infirmity." But is, it may fairly be asked, "who can have compassion," the happiest rendering of μετριοπαθεῖν δυνάμενος? and ought μετριοπαθεῖν to be thus taken as entirely synonymous with συμπαθεῖν? The words, μετριοπαθεῖν, μετριοπάθεια, belong to the terminology of the later schools of Greek philosophy, and were formed to express that moderate amount of emotion (the μετρίως πάσχειν), which the Peripatetics and others acknowledged as becoming a wise and good man, contrasted with the ἀπάθεια, or absolute indolency, which the Stoics required. It seems to me that the Apostle would say that the high priest taken from among men, out of a sense of his own weakness and infirmity was in a condition to estimate mildly and moderately, and not transported with indignation, the sins and errors of his brethren; and it is this view of the passage which is correctly expressed in the margin: "who *can reasonably bear with* the ignorant, &c."

2 Pet. iii. 12.—"*Hasting unto* the coming of the day of God." The Vulgate had in like manner rendered the σπεύδοντες τὴν παρουσίαν, "properantes *in* adventum;" and this use of σπεύδειν may be abundantly justified, although "hasting *toward* the coming" seems to me to express more accurately what our Translators probably intended, and what the word allows. This will then be

pretty nearly De Wette's 'ersehnend.' Yet the marginal version, "*hasting* the coming" ("accelerantes adventum," Erasmus), seems better still. The faithful, that is, shall seek to cause the day of the Lord to come the more quickly by helping to fulfil those conditions, without which it cannot come—that day being no day inexorably fixed, but one, the arrival of which it is free to the Church to help and hasten on by faith and by prayer, and through a more rapid accomplishing of the number of the elect (Matt. xxiv. 14).

CHAPTER VIII.

ON SOME ERRORS OF GREEK GRAMMAR.

I HAVE already spoken of the *English* Grammar of our Translators; but the *Greek* Grammar is also occasionally at fault. The most recurring blemishes which have been noted here, are these. 1. A failing to give due heed to the presence or absence of the article; they omit it sometimes, when it is present in their original, and when, according to the rules of the language, it ought to be preserved in the translation; they insert it, when it is absent there, and has no claim to obtain admission from them. 2. A certain laxity in the rendering of prepositions; for example, ἐν is rendered as if it were εἰς, and *vice versâ;* the different forces of διά, as it governs a genitive or an accusative, are disregarded; with other negligences of the same kind. 3. A want of accurate discrimination of the forces of different tenses; aorists being dealt with as perfects, perfects as aorists; imperfects losing their imperfect incompleted sense. Moods, too, and voices are occasionally confounded. 4. Other grammatical lapses, which cannot be included in any of these divisions, are noticeable. These, however, are the most serious and most recurring. I will give examples of them all.

I. In regard of the Greek article our Translators err both in excess and defect, but oftenest in the latter. They

omit it, and sometimes not without serious loss, in passages where it ought to find place. Such a passage is Rev. vii. 14: "These are they which came out of great tribulation." Rather, "out of *the* great tribulation" (ἐκ τῆς θλίψεως τῆς μεγάλης). The leaving out of the article, so emphatically repeated, causes us to miss the connexion between this passage and Matt. xxiv. 22, 29; Dan. xii. 1. It is the character of the Apocalypse, the crowning book of the Canon, that it abounds with allusions to preceding Scriptures; and, numerous as are those that appear on the surface, those which lie a little below the surface are more numerous still. Thus there can be no doubt that allusion is here to "the great tribulation" (the same phrase, θλῖψις μεγάλη) of the last days, the birth-pangs of the new creation, which our Lord in his prophecy from the Mount had foretold.

Heb. xi. 10.—"He looked for *a* city which hath foundations." Not so; the language is singularly emphatic: "He looked for *the* city which hath *the* foundations" (τὴν τοὺς θεμελίους ἔχουσαν πόλιν), that is, the well-known and often alluded to foundations—in other words, he looked for the New Jerusalem, of which it had been already said, "Her *foundations* are in the holy mountains" (Ps. lxxxvii. 1; cf. Isai. xxviii. 16); even as in the Apocalypse great things are spoken of these glorious foundations of the Heavenly City (Rev. xxi. 14, 19, 20). Let me here observe that those expositors seem to me to be wholly astray who make the Apostle to say that Abraham looked forward to a period when the nomad life which he was now leading should cease, and his descendants be established in a well-ordered city, the earthly Jerusalem. He may, indeed, have looked on to that as a pledge of better things to come; but never to that as "the City having the founda-

tions;" nor do I suppose for an instant that our Translators at all intended this; but still, if they had reproduced the force of the article, they would, in giving the passage its true emphasis, have rendered such a misapprehension on the part of their readers well-nigh impossible.

John iii. 10.—"Art thou *a* teacher of Israel, and knowest not these things?" Middleton may perhaps make too much of ὁ διδάσκαλος here, as though it singled out Nicodemus from among all the Jewish doctors as the one supereminent. Yet it is equally incorrect to deny it all force. Christ, putting him to a wholesome shame, would make him feel how little the realities of his spiritual insight corresponded with the reputation which he enjoyed. "Art thou the teacher, the famed teacher of Israel, and yet art ignorant of these things?" and the question loses an emphasis, which I cannot but believe, with Winer and many more, it was intended to have, by the omission in our Version of all notice of the article.

Acts xvii. 1.—"They came to Thessalonica, where was *a* synagogue of the Jews." Grotius gives well the force of ἡ συναγωγή here, which we have not preserved: "Articulus additus significat Philippis, Amphipoli et Apolloniæ nullas fuisse synagogas, sed si qui ibi essent Judæi, eos synagogam adiisse Thessalonicensem."

In other passages it is plain that a more complete mastery of the use of the article would have modified the rendering of a passage which our Translators have given. It would have done so, I am persuaded, at 1 Tim. vi. 2: "And they that have believing masters, let them not despise them, because they are brethren, but rather do them service, *because they are faithful and beloved, partakers of the benefit*" (ὅτι πιστοί εἰσι καὶ ἀγαπητοί, οἱ τῆς εὐεργεσίας ἀντιλαμβανόμενοι). It is clear that for them

"partakers of the benefit" is but a further unfolding of "faithful and beloved," the 'benefit' being the grace and gift of eternal life, common to master and slave alike. But so the article in this last clause has not its rights, and the only correct translation of the passage will make *πιστοὶ καὶ ἀγαπητοί* the predicate, and *οἱ τῆς εὐεργεσίας ἀντιλαμβανόμενοι* the subject. St. Paul reminds the slaves that they shall serve believing masters the more cheerfully out of the consideration that they do not bestow their service on unconverted unthankful lords, but rather that they who are "partakers of the benefit," that is, the benefit of their service, they to whom this service is rendered, are brethren in Christ. The Vulgate rightly: "quia fideles sunt et dilecti, qui beneficii participes sunt." It needs only to insert the words "who are" before 'partakers,' to make our Version correct.

But more important than in any of these passages, as rendering serious doctrinal misunderstandings possible, is the neglect of the article at Rom. v. 15, 17. In place of any observations of my own, I will here quote Bentley's criticism on our Version. Having found fault with the rendering of *οἱ πολλοί*, Rom. xii. 5, he proceeds: "This will enable us to clear up another place of much greater consequence, Rom. v.; where after the Apostle had said, ver. 12, 'that by one man sin entered into the world, and death by sin, and so death passed *upon all men* (*εἰς πάντας ἀνθρώπους*), for that all have sinned,' in the reddition of this sentence, ver. 15, he says, 'for if through the offence *of one* (*τοῦ ἑνὸς*) *many* (*οἱ πολλοὶ*) be dead' (so our Translators), 'much more the grace of God by *one man* (*τοῦ ἑνὸς*) Jesus Christ hath abounded *unto many*' (*εἰς τοὺς πολλούς*). Now who would not wish that they had kept the articles in the version which they saw in the original? 'If through

the offence of *the one*' (that is Adam) '*the many* have died, much more the grace of God by *the one* man hath abounded unto *the many*.' By this accurate version some hurtful mistakes about partial redemption and absolute reprobation had been happily prevented. Our English readers had then seen, what several of the Fathers saw and testified, that *οἱ πολλοί, the many,* in an antithesis to *the one,* are equivalent to *πάντες, all,* in ver. 12, and comprehend the whole multitude, the entire species of mankind, exclusive only of *the one.* So, again, ver. 18 and 19 of the same chapter, our Translators have repeated the like mistake; where, when the Apostle had said 'that as the offence of one was *upon all men* (*εἰς πάντας ἀνθρώπους*) to condemnation, so the righteousness of one was upon *all men* to justification; for,' adds he, 'as by the one man's (*τοῦ ἑνὸς*) disobedience *the many* (*οἱ πολλοὶ*) were made sinners; so by the obedience of *the one* (*τοῦ ἑνὸς*) *the many* (*οἱ πολλοὶ*) shall be made righteous.' By this version the reader is admonished and guided to remark that *the many,* in ver. 19, are the same as *πάντες, all,* in the 18th. But our Translators when they render it, '*many* were made sinners, *many* were made righteous,' what do they do less than lead and draw their unwary readers into error?"[1]

By far the most frequent fault with our Translators is the omission of the article in the translation when it stands in the original; yet sometimes they fall into the converse error, and insert an article in the English where it does not stand in the Greek; and this too, it may be, not without injury to the sense and intention of the sacred writer. It is so at Rom. ii. 14, where we make St. Paul to say, "For when *the Gentiles,* which have not the law, do by

[1] *A Sermon upon Popery. Works,* vol. iii. p. 245; cf. p. 129.

nature the things contained in the law, these, having not the law, are a law unto themselves." One might conclude from this, that the Apostle regarded such a fulfilling of the law on the part of the Gentiles, as ordinary and normal. Yet it is not τὰ ἔθνη, but ἔθνη, and the passage must be rendered, "For when *Gentiles*, which have not the law, &c.," the Apostle having in these words his eye on the small election of heathendom, the exceptions, and not the rule.

St. Paul has been sometimes charged with exaggeration in declaring that "the love of money is the root of all evil" (1 Tim. vi. 10); and there have been attempts to mitigate the strength of the assertion, as that when he said "*all* evil," he only meant "*much* evil." The help, however, does not lie here; but in more strictly observing what he does say. "The love of money," he declares, "is" —not "*the* root," but—"*a* root, of all evil." He does not affirm that this is *the* bitter root from which all evil springs, but *a* bitter root from which all evil *may* spring; there is no sin of which it may not be, as of which it has not been, the impulsive motive.

Acts xxvi. 2.—"The things whereof I am accused *of the Jews*." The insertion of the article in the English, where there is no article in the Greek, works still more injuriously here. St. Paul is made to account himself happy that he shall answer before King Agrippa of all things whereof he is "accused of the Jews." But he would not for an instant have affirmed or admitted that "*the* Jews" accused him; all true Jews, all who held fast the promises made to the Fathers, and now fulfilled in Christ, were on his side. It is true that he is accused "of *Jews*," unfaithful members of the house of Abraham, by no means "of *the* Jews." The force of ver. 7, in which

our Translators again make St. Paul to speak of being "accused *of the Jews*," is still more seriously impaired. He there puts before Agrippa, a Jewish proselyte, and therefore capable of understanding him, the monstrous self-contradicting absurdity, that for cherishing and asserting the Messias-hope of his nation, he should now be accused—not of heathens, that would have been nothing strange—but "of *Jews*," when that hope was indeed the central treasure of the whole Jewish nation. The point of this part of his speech is not that he is accused, but that it is Jews who accuse him.—Before leaving this point, I may observe that "an Hebrew of Hebrews" (Phil. iii. 5), one, namely, of pure Hebrew blood and language (Ἑβραῖος ἐξ Ἑβραίων), while it is more accurate, would tell also its own story much better than "an Hebrew of *the* Hebrews," as we have it now.

II. Our Translators do not always seize the precise force of the prepositions. They have not done so in the passages which follow:

John iv. 6.—"Jesus therefore, being wearied with his journey, sat thus *on* the well." It should be rather, "*by* the well" (ἐπὶ τῇ πηγῇ), in its immediate neighbourhood. On two other occasions, namely, Mark xiii. 29; John v. 2, they have rightly gone back from the more rigorous rendering of ἐπί with a dative, to which they have here adhered: cf. Exod. ii. 15, LXX.[2]

Rev. xv. 2.—"And I saw, as it were, a sea of glass mingled with fire; and them that had gotten the victory over the beast . . . stand *on the sea of glass*, having the harps of God." It is easy to perceive the inducements

[2] Yet it ought to be said that Winer (*Gramm.* § 52, c.) is on the side of our Version as it stands.

which led our Translators to render ἐπὶ τὴν θάλασσαν τὴν ὑαλίνην, "ρn the sea of glass;" yet much is lost thereby, namely the whole allusion to the earlier triumph by the shores of the Red Sea, typical of this the final triumph of the Church, when the literal Israel sang "the song of Moses" (Exod. xv. 1), a song which never grows old, for God is evermore triumphing gloriously, and which his saints are now at length taking up again. It is, as Bengel gives it rightly, "*by* the sea of glass" ("*ad* mare vitreum"), which "sea of glass" we are not to understand as a solid though diaphanous surface, *on which* these triumphant ones stood or could stand, but "*as it were* a sea of glass," not a 'glassen' but a 'glassy' sea, a sea that might be compared to glass in its clearness and transparency. God's judgments, his government of the Church and the world, this is the great deep, the mystical sea (Ps. xxxvi. 7), on the shores of which his saints stand triumphantly at the end, while his enemies are swallowed up beneath its waves,—"a sea as of glass," inasmuch as it is the visible utterance of his holiness, and shall at the last appear such, clear and transparent to all,—but "as of glass *mingled with fire*," seeing that the wrath and indignation of God against sin, of which wrath fire is the standing symbol in Scripture, find their utterance, no less than his love, in the world's story.

Heb. vi. 7.—"Herbs meet for them *by whom* it is dressed." The Translators give in the margin as an alternative, "*for whom.*" But it is no mere alternative; of δι' οὓς (not δι' ὧν) it is the only rendering which can be admitted. What actually stands in the text, besides being faulty in grammar, disturbs the spiritual image which underlies the passage. The heart of man is here the earth; man is the dresser; but the spiritual culture goes forward,

not that the earth may bring forth that which is meet for him, the dresser *by* whom, but for God, the owner of the soil, *for* whom, it is dressed. The plural δι' οὓς, instead of δι' ὅν, need not trouble us, nor remove us from this, the only right interpretation. The earlier Latin version had it rightly; see Tertullian, *De Pudic.* c. 20: "Terra enim quæ . . . . peperit herbam aptam his, *propter quos* et colitur, &c.;" but the Vulgate, "*a quibus*," anticipates our mistake, in which we only follow the English translations preceding.

Luke xxiii. 42.—"And he said unto Him, Lord, remember me when Thou comest *into thy kingdom.*" But how, it may be asked, could our Lord come *into* his kingdom, when He is Himself the centre of the kingdom, and brings the kingdom with Him, so that where He is, there the kingdom must be? The passage will gain immensely when, leaving that strange and utterly unwarranted assumption that εἰς, a preposition of motion (whither), is convertible with ἐν, a preposition of rest (where), and thus that ἐν τῇ βασιλείᾳ, which stands here, is the same as εἰς τὴν βασιλείαν,—we translate, "Lord, remember me when Thou comest *in thy kingdom*," that is, "with all thy glorious kingdom about Thee," as is so sublimely set forth, Rev. xix. 14: cf. Jude 14; 2 Thess. i. 7; Matt. xxv. 31 (ἐν τῇ δόξῃ). It is the stranger that our Translators should have fallen into this error, seeing that they have translated ἐρχόμενον ἐν τῇ βασιλείᾳ αὐτοῦ (Matt. xvi. 28) quite correctly; "coming *in his kingdom.*" The Vulgate also has "in regno tuo" there, although it shares the error of our Translation, and has "in regnum tuum" here. The exegetical tact of Maldonatus overcomes on this, as on many other occasions, his respect for his 'authentic' Vulgate, and he comments thus: "Itaque non est sensus, Cum

veneris ad regnandum, sed, Cum veneris jam regnans, cum veneris non ad acquirendum regnum, sed regno jam acquisito, quemadmodum venturus ad judicium est." The same faulty rendering of ἐν, and assumption that it may have the force of εἰς, that ἐν χάριτι means the same as εἰς χάριν,[3] occurs Gal. i. 6; and indeed this, or the converse, in too many other passages as well.[4]

2 Cor. xi. 3.—"But I fear lest . . . your minds should be corrupted *from the simplicity that is in Christ*" (ἀπὸ τῆς ἁπλότητος τῆς εἰς τὸν Χριστόν). Here again the injurious supposition that εἰς and ἐν may be confounded, has been at work, and to serious loss in the bringing out of the meaning of the passage. The ἁπλότης here is the simple undivided affection, the singleness of heart, of the Bride, the Church, εἰς Χριστόν, *toward* Christ. It is not their "simplicity *in Christ*," or Christian simplicity, which the Apostle fears lest they may, through addiction to worldly wisdom,

---

[3] Some good words on this matter are found in Windischmann's Commentary on this Epistle, in loco: "ἐν χάριτι wird zumeist mit διὰ χάριτος, oder (mit Berufung auf Eph. iv. 4) εἰς χάριτα (Vulg. 'in gratiam') identisch genommen, ist aber significativer und bezeichnet, dass der Ruf nicht bloss *zur* Gnade Christi ergeht, sondern *in* der Gnade des Heilandes, d. h. der von ihm verdienten und von ihm als dem Haupte ausströmenden (Rom. v. 15) wurzelt, dass die Auserwählung der Berufenen in der Gnade des Auserwählter κατ' ἐξοχήν beschlossen ist (Eph. i. 4)."

[4] See Winer's *Gramm.* § 54. 4, where he enters at length into the question whether εἰς is ever used for ἐν, or ἐν for εἰς, in the New Testament. Notwithstanding the original identity of the two prepositions, εἰς being only another form of ἐν, and the many passages which *seem* to make for their indiscriminate use, as Matt. x. 16; Luke vii. 17; Matt. ii. 23; John ix. 7; or again, the comparison of Matt. xxi. 8 with Mark xi. 8, or Mark i. 16 with Matt. iv. 18, he affirms that in one the sense of motion is always inherent, in the other of rest.

forfeit and let go; but, still moving in the images of espousals and marriage, that they may not bring a simple undivided heart *to* Christ. If after ἁπλότητος we should also read καὶ τῆς ἁγνότητος, which seems probable, it will then be clearer still what St. Paul's intention was.

2 Pet. i. 5-7.—"Add *to* your faith virtue, and *to* virtue knowledge, and *to* knowledge temperance, and *to* temperance patience, and *to* patience godliness, &c." (ἐπιχορηγήσατε ἐν τῇ πίστει ὑμῶν τὴν ἀρετήν, κ. τ. λ.). Tyndale had rendered the passage: "*In* your faith minister virtue, and *in* your virtue knowledge, &c.," and all translations up to the Authorized had followed him. Henry More[5] has well expressed the objection to the present version: "Grotius would have ἐν to be redundant here; so that his suffrage is for the English translation. But, for my own part, I think that ἐν is so far from being redundant that it is essential to the sentence, and interposed that we might understand a greater mystery than the mere adding of so many virtues one to another, which would be all that could be expressly signified if ἐν were left out. But the preposition here signifying causality, there is more than a mere enumeration of those divine graces. For there is also implied how naturally they rise one out of another, and that they have a causal dependence one of another." See this same thought beautifully carried out in detail by Bengel, in loco.

III. Our Translators do not always give the true force of tenses, moods, and voices.

Oftentimes the present tense is used in the New Testament, especially by St. John in the Apocalypse, to express the eternal Now of Him for whom there can be no past

[5] *On Godliness*, b. viii. c. 3.

and no future. It must be considered a fault, when this is let go, and exchanged for a past tense in our Version. Take, for instance, Rev. iv. 5: "Out of the throne *proceeded* lightnings, and thunderings, and voices." But it is much more than this; not merely at that one moment when St. John beheld, but evermore out of his throne *proceed* (ἐκπορεύονται) these symbols of the presence and of the terrible majesty of God. Throughout this chapter, and at chapter i. 14-16, there is often a needless, and sometimes an absolutely incorrect, turning of the present of eternity into the past of time.

Elsewhere a past is turned without cause into a present. It is so at Acts xxviii. 4: "No doubt this man is a murderer, whom, though he hath escaped the sea, yet Vengeance *suffereth not* to live." A fine turn in the exclamation of these barbarous islanders has been missed in our Version, and in all the English versions except the Geneva. The βάρβαροι, the 'natives,' as I think the word might have been fairly translated, who must have best known the qualities of the vipers then existing on the island, are so confident of the deadly character of that one which has fastened itself on Paul's hand, that they regard and speak of him as one *already dead*, and in this sense use a past tense; he is one whom "Vengeance *suffered not* (οὐκ εἴασεν) to live." Bengel: "*Non sivit*; jam nullum putant esse Paulum;" De Wette: "nicht habt leben lassen." Let me observe here, by the way, that our modern editions of the Bible should not have dropped the capital V with which 'Vengeance' was spelt in the exemplar edition of 1611. These islanders, in their simple but most truthful moral instincts, did not contemplate 'Vengeance' or Δίκη in the abstract; but personified her as a goddess; and our Translators, who are by no means prodigal of their capi-

tals, in their manner of spelling the word, did their best to mark and reproduce this personification of the divine Justice, although the carelessness of printers has since let it go.

Elsewhere there is confusion between the uses of the present and the perfect. There is such, for example, at Luke xviii. 12: "I give tithes of all that I *possess*." But ὅσα κτῶμαι is not, "all that I *possess*," but, "all that I *acquire*" ("quæ mihi acquiro, quæ mihi redeunt"). The Vulgate, which has 'possideo,' shares, perhaps suggested, our error. In the perfect κέκτημαι the word first obtains the force of "I possess," or, in other words, "I *have acquired*."[6] The Pharisee would boast himself to be, so to say, another Jacob, such another as he who had said, "Of all that *Thou shalt give me*, I will surely give the tenth unto Thee" (Gen. xxviii. 22; cf. xiv. 20), a careful performer of that precept of the law, which said, "Thou shalt truly tithe all the increase of thy seed, that the field bringeth forth year by year" (Deut. xiv. 22); but change 'acquire' into 'possess,' and how much of this we lose.

We must associate with this passage another, namely, Luke xxi. 19: "In your patience *possess ye* your souls;" for the same correction ought there to find place. It is rather, "In your patience *make ye* your souls your own"—that is, "In and by your patience or endurance *acquire* your souls as something which you may indeed call your own" ("salvas obtinete"). Thus Winer: "Durch Ausdauer erwerbt euch eure Seelen; sie werden dann erst euer wahres, unverlierbares Eigenthum werden." It is noticeable that our Translators have corrected the 'possess' of all the preceding versions at Matt. x. 9, exchanging this for the more accurate 'provide' (κτήσησθε), or, as it is in

[6] See Winer, *Gramm.* § 41. 4.

the margin, 'get;' which makes it strange that they should have allowed it in these other places to stand.

Imperfects lose their proper force, and are dealt with as aorists and perfects. The vividness of the narration often suffers from the substitution of the pure historic for what may be called the descriptive tense; as, for example, at Luke xiv. 7: "He put forth a parable to those that were bidden when He marked how they *chose out* the chief rooms." Read, "how they *were choosing out* (ἐξελέγοντο) the chief rooms"—the sacred historian placing the Lord's utterance of the parable in the midst of the events which he is describing. So Acts iii. 1: "Now Peter and John *went up* together into the temple." Read, "*were going up*" (ἀνέβαινον). Again, Mark ii. 18: "And the disciples of John and of the Pharisees *used to fast*." Read, "*were fasting*" (ἦσαν νηστεύοντες), namely, at that very time; which gives a special vigour to their remonstrances; they were keeping a fast while the Lord's disciples were celebrating a festival. The incomplete, *imperfect* sense, which so often belongs to this tense, and from which it derives its name, they often fail to give; the commencement of a work which is not brought to a conclusion, the consent and coöperation of another party, which was necessary for its completion, having been withheld; in such cases the will is taken for the deed.[7] Thus, Luke i. 59: "And they *called* him Zacharias." It is not so, for Elizabeth would not allow this name to be given him; but with the true force of the incomplete imperfect tense: "And they *were calling* (ἐκάλουν) him Zacharias." Once more, Luke v. 6: "And their net *brake*." Had this been so, they would scarcely have secured the fishes at all. Rather, "was in the

[7] See Jelf's *Kühner's Grammar*, § 398. 2.

act of breaking," or, "was at the point to break" (διερρήγνυτο). Other passages where they do not give the force of the imperfect, but deal with it as though it had been a perfect or an aorist, are John iii. 22; iv. 47; vi. 21; Luke xxiv. 32; Matt. xiii. 34; Acts xi. 20.

Aorists are rendered as if they were perfects; and perfects as if they were aorists. Thus we have an example of the first, Luke i. 19, where ἀπεστάλην is translated as though it were ἀπέσταλμαι, "I *am* sent," instead of, "I *was* sent." Gabriel contemplates his mission not at the moment of its present fulfilment, but from that of his first sending forth from the presence of God. Another example of the same occurs at 2 Pet. i. 14: "Knowing that shortly I must put off this my tabernacle, even as our Lord Jesus Christ *hath showed* me." By this "*hath* showed me" we lose altogether the special allusion to an historic moment in the Apostle's life, to John xxi. 18, 19, which would at once come out, if ἐδήλωσέ μοι had been rendered, "showed me." Doubtless there are passages which would make difficult the universal application of the rule that perfects should be translated as perfects, and aorists as aorists: thus Luke xiv. 18, 19, where one might hesitate in rendering ἠγόρασα 'I *bought*,' instead of 'I *have bought*;' and some at least in the long line of aorists, ἐδόξασα, ἐτελείωσα, ἐφανέρωσα, ἔλαβον (ver. 4, 6, 8), in the high-priestly prayer, John xvii. Still on these passages no conclusion can be grounded that the writers of the New Testament did not always observe the distinction.[8]

Again, the force of the aorist is missed, though in another way, at Mark xvi. 2, where ἀνατείλαντος τοῦ ἡλίου is translated, "*at the rising* of the sun." It can only be,

[8] See Winer, *Gramm.* § 41. 5.

"when the sun *was risen*." Did the anxiety to avoid a slight seeming discrepancy between this statement and that of two other Evangelists (Matt. xxviii. 1; Mark xvi. 2) modify the translation here?

Examples, on the other hand, of perfects turned into aorists are frequent. Thus at Luke xiii. 2: "Suppose ye that these Galileans were sinners above all the Galileans, because *they suffered* such things?" Rather, "because *they have suffered* (πεπόνθασιν) such things." Our Lord contemplates the catastrophe in which they perished, not as something belonging merely to the historic past; but as a fact reaching into the present; still vividly presenting itself to the mind's eye of his hearers.

One other example must suffice. In that great doctrinal passage, Col. i. 13-22, St. Paul declares, ver. 16, that "by Christ *were* all things *created*." The aorist ἐκτίσθη has its right force given to it here; but the Apostle in a most remarkable way, when in the last clause of the verse he resumes the doctrine of the whole, changes the aorist ἐκτίσθη for the perfect ἔκτισται. And why? Because he is no longer looking at the one historic act of creation, but at the permanent results flowing on into all time and eternity therefrom. Our Translators have not followed him here, but, as if no change had been made, they render this clause also: "All things *were created* by Him, and for Him;" but read rather: "All things *have been created* by Him, and for Him."[9]

---

[9] The fact that we almost all learn our grammar from the Latin, and that in the Latin the perfect indicative does its own duty and that of the aorist as well, renders us very inobservant of inaccuracies in this particular kind, till we have been specially trained to observe them.

Imperfects and aorists are turned without necessity into pluperfects. It is admitted by all that an aorist, under certain conditions, may have this sense of a past behind another past;[10] nor, according to some, can this force be altogether denied to the imperfect; but a pluperfect force is given in our Version to these tenses where certainly no sort of necessity requires it. Thus, for the words, "because *He had done* these things on the sabbath" (John v. 16), read, "because *He did* (ἐποίει) these things on the sabbath." And, again, in the same chapter read, "for Jesus *conveyed Himself away*" (ἐξένευσεν); that is, so soon as this discussion between the Jews and the healed man arose, not, "*had conveyed Himself away*" previously, as our Version would imply.

Neither do our Translators always give its right force to a middle verb. They fail to do so at Phil. ii. 15: "Among whom *ye shine* as lights in the world." To justify this "*ye shine*," which is common to all the Versions of the English Hexapla, St. Paul ought to have written φαίνετε, and not φαίνεσθε, as he has written. Φαίνειν, indeed, is 'to shine' (John i. 5; 2 Pet. i. 19; Rev. i. 16); but φαίνεσθαι 'to appear' (Matt. xxxiii. 27; 1 Pet. iv. 18; Jam. iv. 14). It is worthy of note, that while the Vulgate, having 'lucetis,' shares and anticipates our error, an earlier Italic version was free from it; as is evident from the verse as quoted by Augustine (*Enarr. in Ps.* cxlvi. 4): "In quibus *apparetis* tanquam luminaria in mundo."

Sometimes the force of a passive is lost. Thus is it at 2 Cor. v. 10: "For we must all *appear* before the judgment-seat of Christ." The words contain a yet more solemn and awful announcement than this: "For we must

[10] What these conditions are, see Winer's *Gramm.* § 41. 5.

all *be made manifest*" (*πάντας ἡμᾶς φανερωθῆναι δεῖ*), exhibited as what we indeed are, displayed in our true colours, the secrets of our hearts disclosed, and we, so to speak, *turned inside out* (for the word means nothing less), "before the judgment-seat of Christ." There is often reason to think that the exposition of Chrysostom exercised considerable influence on our Translators. Here it might have done so with benefit; for commenting on these words (*in Cor. Hom.* 10) he says: *οὐ γὰρ παραστῆναι ἡμᾶς ἁπλῶς δεῖ, ἀλλὰ καὶ φανερωθῆναι*, showing that he would not have been satisfied with what our Translators have here done.

With one or two miscellaneous observations I will conclude this chapter. It would be very impertinent to suppose that our Translators, who numbered in their company many of the first scholars of their time, were not perfectly at home in the use of *πᾶς*, and familiar with the very simple modifications of its meaning as employed with or without an article; and yet it must be owned that they do not always observe its rules. One example may suffice.

Acts x. 12.—"Wherein were *all manner of four-footed beasts* of the earth." But *πάντα τὰ τετράποδα* cannot possibly have the meaning ascribed to it here. Translate rather: "Wherein were *all the four-footed beasts* of the earth"—"omnia animalia," as the Vulgate rightly has it. Here probably, as Winer observes, they were tempted to forsake the more accurate rendering from an unwillingness to ascribe something which seemed to them like exaggeration to the sacred historian: how, they said to themselves, could "all the four-footed beasts of the earth" be contained in that sheet? For indeed this shrinking from a meaning which an accurate translation would render up, is a very frequent occasion of mistranslation, and also

of warped exegesis. It is much better, however, that the translator should go forward on *his* task without regard to such considerations as these. The Word of God can take care of, and vindicate itself, and does not need to be thus taken under man's protection.[11]

It is remarkable how little careful our Translators are to note the difference between the verb of *being* and that of *becoming;* between εἰμί and γέγονα. I do not indeed think it possible to carry out the distinction between εἶναι and γίνεσθαι in every instance, without occasional awkwardnesses of translation: it seems to me that Professor Ellicott has not quite escaped these, Ephes. v. 7, 17; and that we must recognize at times a certain idiomatic use of γίνου and γίνεσθε, best represented by 'be' and 'be ye.' Still the passages are numerous where the words cannot be confounded, as our Translators have confounded them, without loss. Thus, at Heb. v. 11, the Apostle complains of the difficulty of unfolding some hard truths to those whom he addresses, "seeing ye *are* dull of hearing." But

[11] There are some good observations on this matter in Laurence Humphrey's excellent treatise, *Interpretatio Linguarum, seu de ratione convertendi auctores tam sacros quam profanos.* Basileæ, 1559. He is finding fault with those who in translating seek to mitigate such expressions as the σκληρύνει of Rom. ix. 18, παρέδωκε of Rom. i. 24, εἰσενέγκῃς of Matt. vi. 13, and says, "Non est locus hic interpretationibus nostro Marte et ingenio confictis, cum se Spiritus Sanctus exponit, optimus magister interpretandi, cujus linguam fas non est homini mutare aut temperare. Satis molliter loquitur, qui cum illo dure loquitur. Explicationis varietas relinquatur cuivis libera. *Interpres hanc libertatem si tollat, bono jure non tollit, sed lectori facit injuriam.*" And elsewhere, against some who rendered the παρέδωκε above referred to, 'permisit,' he observes, "Non est durum quod Spiritus Sanctus putarit non esse durum, nec frigidis hominum temperamentis sermo divinus modificandus." p. 174.

the rebuke is sharper than this—"seeing ye *have become* dull of hearing" (ἐπεὶ νωθροὶ γεγόνατε ταῖς ἀκοαῖς). This would imply that it was not so once, in the former days, when they first were enlightened (x. 32); but that now they had gone back from that liveliness of spiritual apprehension which once had been theirs (see Chrysostom). The Vulgate has it rightly: "Quoniam imbecilles *facti estis* ad audiendum;" being followed by the Rheims: "Because ye are *become* weak to hear;" so, too, De Wette: "Da ihr träge von Verstande *geworden seid.*" Compare the next verse, where γεγόνατε again occurs, and where the force of it *is* given. At Matt. xxiv. 32, there is the same loss of the true force of the word. Not the *being* tender of the branch of the fig-tree, but the *becoming* tender, that is, through the returning sap of spring, is the sign of the nearness of summer.

Nor are the occasions wanting, when the maintenance of the distinction is far more important, as at John viii. 58. They make no attempt to preserve there the antithesis, dogmatically so important, between Abraham's *birth* in time, and Christ's *subsistance* through eternity (πρὶν Ἀβραὰμ γενέσθαι, ἐγὼ εἰμί). How this should have been effected may be a question; whether as Cranmer has done it, "Ere Abraham was born, I am," or as the Rhemish, "Before that Abraham was made, I am," or by some other device; but in some form or other it should assuredly have been attempted. In the Vulgate, "Antequam Abraham *fieret*, ego *sum.*"[12]

---

[12] Sydenham (*The Arraignment of the Arian*, p. 93) puts it well: "*Was* points only to a human constitution; *I am* to a divine substance [qy. subsistance]; and therefore the original hath a γενέσθαι for Abraham, and an εἰμί for Christ."

In other points our Translators are without fault, where yet the modern copies by careless reproduction of their work involve them in apparent error; which indeed is none of theirs, but that of the too careless guardians of their text. They have their own burden to bear; they ought not to be made to bear the burden of others. But they do so in more places than one. Thus at Matt. xii. 23, correcting all our previous translations, they gave the words, *μήτι οὗτός ἐστιν ὁ υἱὸς Δαβίδ*; with perfect accuracy: "Is this the Son of David?" fully understanding that, according to the different idioms of the Greek and English, the negative particle of the original was not to re-appear in the English; cf. Acts vii. 42; John viii. 22; xviii. 35. I am unable to say at what time the reading which appears in all our modern Bibles, "Is *not* this the Son of David?" first crept in; it is already in Hammond, 1659; but it is little creditable to those who should have kept their text inviolate, that they have not exercised a stricter vigilance over it. It is curious that having escaped error here, our Translators should yet have fallen into it in the exactly similar phrase at John iv. 29, *μήτι οὗτός ἐστιν ὁ Χριστός*; where they *do* render, "Is *not* this the Christ?" but should have rendered, "Is this the Christ?" or, "Can this be the Christ?" The Samaritan woman in her joy, as speaking of a thing too good to be true, which she will suggest, but dare not absolutely affirm, asks of her fellow-countrymen, "Is this the Christ?—can this be He whom we have looked for so long?"—expecting in reply not a negative, but an affirmative, answer.

Let me take this occasion of observing that elsewhere we have to complain of a like carelessness. Thus there are passages in which the punctuation of the exemplar edition of 1611 gave an accurate rendering, while the sub-

sequent abandonment of that punctuation lends an appearance of incorrectness to our Version from which it is really free. Thus, in modern editions, we read at John xviii. 3, "Judas then, having received a band of men and officers from the chief priests and Pharisees, cometh." This would make the traitor to have received the "band of men" *and* the "officers" alike from the chief priests and Pharisees. Such was not the case; the "band of men" were the Roman soldiers, whom he received from the Roman authorities; while the "officers" only, or officials, as we should now say, he received from the chief priests and Pharisees. In the original edition there was a comma after "band of men," which has subsequently been dropped, and then all was correct.

Being on this subject, I will call attention to another passage where the original punctuation has been abandoned. It is Heb. xii. 23. All who have critically studied this epistle know that, in respect of this verse and that preceding, there is a much-debated question, how the different clauses should be divided. Now I do not undertake to affirm that our Translators were right, though there is much to say for the scheme of the passage which they evidently favour; but when they punctuated this verse as follows, "To the general assembly, and Church of the first-born which are written in heaven," they meant something different from that which the verse as it is now punctuated, "To the general assembly and Church of the first-born, which are written in heaven," means; and their punctuation should not have been disturbed. The disturbing of it is in fact an unacknowledged revision of the translation.

CHAPTER IX.

ON SOME QUESTIONABLE RENDERINGS OF WORDS.

THERE are a certain number of passages in which no one can charge our Translators with error, the version they have given being entirely defensible, and numbering among its upholders some, it may be many, well worthy to be heard; while yet another version on the whole will commend itself as preferable to that which they have adopted. I shall proceed to adduce a few such passages, where, to me at least, it seems there is a higher probability, in some a far higher, in favour of some other translation rather than of that which they have admitted.

Matt. vi. 27; cf. Luke xii. 25.—"Which of you by taking thought can add one cubit unto his *stature?*" Erasmus was, I believe, the first who suggested that ἡλικία here was not 'stature,' but "length of life." With him it was no more than a suggestion; but it has since found acceptance with many, with Hammond, Wolf, Wetstein, Olshausen, Meyer, and others. While the present translation may be abundantly justified,—Fritzsche stands out for it still,—yet this certainly appears far preferable to me, and for the following reasons: *a.* In that natural rhetoric of which our Lord was the great master, He would not have named a cubit, which is about a foot and a half, but some very small measure, and reminded his hearers that

they could not add even this to their stature. It would have scarcely been in the spirit of this rhetoric to ask, "Which of you with all his caring can make himself a *foot* taller than God has made him?" Rather Christ would have demanded, "Which of you with all his anxious care can add an inch or a hair's breadth (ἐλάχιστον, Luke xii. 26) to his stature?" β. Men do not practically take thought about adding to their stature; it is not an object of anxiety to one in a thousand to be taller than God has made him; this could scarcely therefore be cited as one of the vain solicitudes of men. γ. On the other hand every thing exactly fits, when we understand our Lord to be asking this question about life and the possibility of adding the least fraction to its length. The cubit, which is much when compared with a man's stature, is infinitesimally little, and therefore most appropriate, when compared to his length of life, that life being contemplated as a course, or δρόμος (2 Tim. iv. 7), which he may attempt, but ineffectually, to prolong. δ. And then, further, this prolonging of life is something which men do seek; striving, by various precautions, by solicitous care, to lengthen the period of their mortal existence; to which yet they cannot add so much as a single cubit more than has been apportioned to it by God.

Luke ii. 49.—"Wist ye not that I must be *about my Father's business?*" But ἐν τοῖς τοῦ Πατρός will as well mean "in my Father's house:" and if the words will mean this as well, they will surely mean it better. We shall thus have a more direct answer on the part of the Child Jesus to the implied rebuke of his blessed Mother's words, "Behold thy father and I have sought Thee sorrowing;" to which He answers, "How is it that ye sought Me?"—that is, in any other place? "Wist ye not that I must be

in my Father's house? here in the temple; and here without lengthened seeking ye might have found Me at once." There was a certain misconception in respect of his person and character, which had led them to look for Him in other places of resort rather than in the temple.

John xii. 6.—"He was a thief, and had the bag, and *bare* what was put therein." I cannot but think that it was St. John's intention to say not merely that Judas "bare," but that he "bare *away*," purloined, or pilfered what was put into the common purse. It seems a tautology to say that he "had the bag, and *bare* what was put therein;" unless indeed it is said that the latter clause was introduced to explain the *opportunities* which he enjoyed of playing the thief; hardly, as it appears to me, a sufficient justification. On the other hand, the use of *βαστάζειν* not in the sense of 'portare,' but of 'auferre,' is frequent; it is so used by Josephus, *Antt.* xiv. 7, 1, and in the New Testament, John xx. 15, and such, I am persuaded, is the use of it here. We note that already in Augustine's time the question had arisen which was the right way to deal with the words; for, commenting on the 'portabat' which he found in his Italic, as it has kept its place in the Vulgate, he asks, "Portabat, an exportabat? Sed ministerio portabat, furto exportabat." Here he might seem to leave his own interpretation of the passage undecided; not so however at *Ep.* 108, 3: "Ipsi [Apostoli] de illo scripserunt quod fur erat, et omnia quæ mittebantur de dominicis loculis *auferebat*." After all is said, there will probably always remain upholders of one translation and upholders of the other; yet to my mind the probabilities are much in favour of that version which I observe that the "Five Clergymen" have also adopted.

Acts xvii. 18.—"What will this *babbler* say?" 'Bab-

bler' here is very well, and yet I cannot but feel that 'chatterer' is *the* word. It unites by a singular felicity the two meanings that meet in σπερμολόγος, being, like it, at once the name of a bird, and a name given to a slight idle talker. Σπερμολόγος is properly a little bird so called from its gathering up of seeds. It is then by transfer, 1st, a mean person, who gets his living somewhat as this bird does, haunts corn-markets and other places of resort for the gathering up of the offals and leavings there—like Autolycus, "a picker up of unconsidered trifles;" 2dly, one who idly chatters as this bird does. Some lines of Shakespeare so curiously illustrate this σπερμολόγος, even to the image on which the word rests, that I cannot resist quoting them. Of a slight talkative person it is said,

> "This fellow pecks up wit as pigeons peas,
> And utters it again when God doth please.
> He is wit's pedlar, and retails his wares
> At wakes and wassails, meetings, markets, fairs."[1]

At the same time it must always remain a question, whether, leaving this of babbling or chattering altogether out, 'paltry fellow,' or 'base fellow,' as in our margin, would not better express the intention of the word.[2] The curious and barbarous 'seminiverbius' of the Vulgate, which reappears as 'word-sower' in the Rhemish, rests evidently on

---

[1] *Love's Labour's Lost*, Act v. sc. 1.

[2] See an excellent article on σπερμολόγος in Suicer's *Thesaurus*. It is to this conclusion that Boisius, in a learned note in his able work, *Veteris Interpretis cum Bezâ aliisque Recentioribus Collatio*, p. 428, arrives: "Paulus σπερμολόγος audit a philosophis Atheniensibus non ut locutuleius aut blaterator aliquis, sed ut homo tenuissimæ fortunæ, parumque splendide vestitus. Est enim convicium in viles potius quam verbosos."

a misreading of the word. It should be σπειρολογος,—though indeed λογοσπόρος is the form which the word must have assumed—to justify this.

Rom. i. 26, 27.—I speak with hesitation, yet incline strongly to think that in this awful passage where St. Paul dares to touch on two of the worst enormities of the heathen world, and with purest lips to speak, and that with all necessary plainness, of the impurest things, we should have done well, if we had followed even to the utmost where he would lead us. For 'men' and 'women,' as often as the words occur in these verses, I should wish to see substituted 'males' and 'females;' ἄρσενες and θήλειαι are throughout the words which St. Paul employs. It is true that something must be indulged to the delicacy of modern Christian ears; our Translators have evidently so considered in dealing with more than one passage in the Old Testament; but, reading these verses over with this substitution, while they gain in emphasis, while they represent more exactly the terrible charge which St. Paul brings against the cultivated world of heathendom, they do not seem to me to acquire any such painful explicitness as they ought not to have, hardly more of this than they possessed before.

1 Cor. xiii. 12.—"For now we see *through* a glass (δι' ἐσόπτρου), darkly." I cannot but think that, for the avoiding of misconception, it would have been preferable, "For now we see *by* a glass, darkly," marking so that διά is here instrumental. For what is the natural conclusion of every one who, without reference to the Greek, hears or reads the words as they now stand? What can it be, but that they express an imperfect seeing *through* some dim, only semi-transparent medium, as talc, horn, crystal, lapis specularis, or the like, such as did for the ancients that

service which glass now so much better accomplishes for us? This, however, it is needless to say, would be *δίοπτρα* or *δίοπτρον*, while *ἔσοπτρον* (=*κάτοπτρον*) can mean only a looking-glass; and when we remember the polished metallic mirrors, which were the only ones which antiquity knew, and the dim obscure *ἀπαύγασμα*, which was all that they could have given back, we shall feel the exquisite fitness of this image, both in respect of the indistinctness of the seeing, and in respect of its being, as is well said in the passage which follows, "no immediate vision." That citation is drawn from an old English divine, less known than he deserves, and is much to the point: "Some that would be more critical than they need, would fain show us a difference between *ἔσοπτρον* and *κάτοπτρον*. *Κάτοπτρον* indeed with them is a looking-glass, but *ἔσοπτρον* is some other glass; either such an one as is for the help of weak and aged eyes, and then 'tis, we see through spectacles; or else such as presents the object though afar off, and so 'tis, we see through a perspective. The Vulgar Latin, *that* will have it *per transennam*, 'through a lattice,' as the Spouse in the Canticles is said to flourish through the lattices. And all these urge the force of the preposition *δι' ἐσόπτρου*, we see *through* a glass or *through* a lattice. But they might easily know that *δι' ἐσόπτρου* here is the same as *ἐν ἐσόπτρῳ*; and though it be true that *κάτοπτρον* be the more usual word for a looking-glass, yet it is as true that *ἔσοπτρον* signifies the same. Hesychius makes them synonymous, and the word is but once more used in the New Testament, Jam. i. 23, and there can be no doubt that there 'tis taken for a looking-glass. Well, then, our dark imperfect knowledge of God here is thus set forth by seeing in a glass; because it is no immediate vision; the object is not primarily and immediately presented to the eye, but by way

of resultancy and *mediante speculo*, by the conveyance of the looking-glass, which is a silent interpreter of the object. And such is our knowledge of God here, and such our communion with Him; only some broken beams of glory, some glimpses of his presence scattered here and there, in this ordinance and in that,—glasses of his own making, means of his proper institution."[3]

2 Cor. ii. 14.—"Now thanks be unto God, which always *causeth us to triumph* in Christ." Here, too, our Translators may be right, and, if they are wrong, it is in good company. I must needs think that for "causeth us to triumph" we should read, "leadeth us in triumph;" and that the Vulgate, when it rendered θριαμβεύων ἡμᾶς, "qui triumphat nos," and Jerome (which is the same thing), "qui triumphat de nobis," though even he has failed to bring out his meaning with clearness, were right. Θριαμβεύειν occurs but on one other occasion in the New Testament (Col. ii. 5). No one there doubts that it means, 'to lead in triumph,' 'to make a show of,' as vanquished and subdued; and it is hard to withdraw this meaning from it here, being as it also is the only meaning of the word in classical Greek; thus Plutarch, *Thes. et Rom.* iv.: βασιλεῖς ἐθριάμβευσε καὶ ἡγεμόνας, "he led kings and captains in triumph;" and see other examples in Wetstein. But, it may be asked, what will St. Paul mean by the declaration, "who every where leadeth us in triumph in Christ"? The meaning is, indeed, a very grand one. St. Paul did not feel it inconsistent with the profoundest humility, to regard himself as a signal trophy and token of God's victorious power in Christ. Lying with his face upon the ground, he had anticipated, though in another sense, the words of

[3] Culverwell, *Spiritual Opticks*, p. 173.

another fighter against God, "Vicisti, Galilæe;" and now his Almighty Conqueror was leading him about through all the cities of the Greek and Roman world, an illustrious testimony of his power at once to subdue and to save. The foe of Christ was now, as he gloried in naming himself, the servant of Christ: and this, his mighty transformation, God was making manifest to the glory of his name in every place. The attempt of some to combine the meanings of "being led in triumph," which they feel that the word demands, and 'triumphing' or "being made to triumph," which it seems to them the sense demands, is in my judgment an attempt to reconcile irreconcileable images; as, for instance, when Stanley says, "The sense of conquest and degradation is lost in the more general sense of 'making us to share this triumph.'" But in the literal triumph who so pitiable, so abject, so forlorn, as the captive chief or king, the Jugurtha or Vercingetorix, doomed often, as soon as he had graced the show, to a speedy and miserable death? But it is not with God as with man; for while to be led in triumph of men is the most miserable, to be led in triumph of God, as the willing trophy of his power, is the most glorious and blessed lot which could fall to any; and it is this, I am persuaded, which the Apostle claims for his own.

2 Cor. ii. 17.—"For we are not as many, *which corrupt* the Word of God." Doubtless there is much to be said in favour of this version of καπηλεύοντες τὸν λόγον τοῦ Θεοῦ. Καπηλεύειν is often 'to adulterate,' νοθεύειν, as Chrysostom expounds it, "to mingle false with true," as the κάπηλος, or petty huckster, would frequently do. Still the matter is by no means so clear in favour of this meaning of καπηλεύειν, and against the other, "to make a traffic of," as some in later times would have it; and the

words ἐξ εἰλικρινείας, which Meyer conceives decisive, seem to me rather an argument the other way. What so natural as that St. Paul should put back the charge of making a traffic with the Word of God; above all, seeing how earnestly elsewhere in this Epistle he clears himself from similar charges (xii. 14, 17)? I believe when Tyndale rendered καπηλεύειν here, "to chop and change with," he was on the right track; and many will remember the remarkable passage in Bentley's *Sermon upon Popery*, which is so strong in this view, that, long as it is, I cannot forbear to quote it: "Our English Translators have not been very happy in their version of this passage. We are not, says the Apostle, καπηλεύοντες τὸν λόγον τοῦ Θεοῦ, which our Translators have rendered, 'We do not corrupt' or (as in the margin) deal deceitfully with 'the Word of God.' They were led to this by the parallel place, c. iv. of this Epistle, ver. 2, 'not walking in craftiness,' μηδὲ δολοῦντες τὸν λόγον τοῦ Θεοῦ, 'nor handling the Word of God deceitfully;' they took καπηλεύοντες and δολοῦντες in the same adequate notion, as the vulgar Latin had done before them, which expresses both by the same word, *adulterantes* verbum Dei; and so, likewise, Hesychius makes them synonyms, ἐκκαπηλεύειν, δολοῦν. Δολοῦν, indeed, is fitly rendered adulterare; so δολοῦν τὸν χρυσὸν, τὸν οἶνον, to adulterate gold or wine, by mixing worse ingredients with the metal or liquor. And our Translators had done well if they had rendered the latter passage, not adulterating, not sophisticating the Word. But καπηλεύοντες in our text has a complex idea and a wider signification; καπηλεύειν always comprehends δολοῦν; but δολοῦν never extends to καπηλεύειν, which, besides the sense of adulterating, has an additional notion of unjust lucre, gain, profit, advantage. This is plain from

the word *κάπηλος*, a calling always infamous for avarice and knavery: perfidus hic caupo, says the poet, as a general character. Thence *καπηλεύειν*, by an easy and natural metaphor, was diverted to other expressions where cheating and lucre were signified: *καπηλεύειν τὸν λόγον*, says the Apostle here, and the ancient Greeks, *καπηλεύειν τὰς δίκας, τὴν εἰρήνην, τὴν σοφίαν, τὰ μαθήματα*, to corrupt and sell justice, to barter a negotiation of peace, to prostitute learning and philosophy for gain. Cheating, we see, and adulterating is part of the notion of *καπηλεύειν*, but the principal essential of it is sordid lucre. So cauponari in the famous passage of Ennius, where Pyrrhus refuses the offer of a ransom for his captives, and restores them gratis:

> Non mi aurum posco, nec mi pretium dederitis,
> Non cauponanti bellum, sed belligeranti.

And so the Fathers expound this place. . . . . So that, in short, what St. Paul says, *καπηλεύοντες τὸν λόγον*, might be expressed in one classic word—*λογέμποροι*, or *λογοπρᾶται*, where the idea of gain and profit is the chief part of the signification. Wherefore, to do justice to our text, we must not stop lamely with our Translators, 'corrupters of the Word of God;' but add to it as its plenary notion, 'corrupters of the Word of God *for filthy lucre*.'"[4]

Col. ii. 8.—"Beware lest any man *spoil you* through philosophy and vain deceit." This translation may very well hold its place: *συλαγωγεῖν* does mean to rob or spoil; this, however, is its secondary meaning; its first, and that which agrees with its etymology (*σῦλον* and *ἄγω*) would be, 'to lead away the spoil,' "prædam abigere;" and certainly the warning would be more emphatic if we understood it

[4] *Works*, vol. iii. p. 242.

as a warning lest they should become themselves the spoil or booty of these false teachers: "Beware lest any man *make a booty of you,* lead you away as his spoil, through philosophy and vain deceit." Bengel: "*συλαγωγῶν,* qui non solum *de vobis,* sed *vos ipsos* spolium faciat."

Col. ii. 23.—"Which things have indeed a show of wisdom in will-worship, and humility, and neglecting of the body, *not in any honour to the satisfying of the flesh.*" The first part of this verse, itself not very easy, appears to me to be excellently rendered in our Version. Perhaps, were it to do again, instead of "a *show* of wisdom," "a *reputation* of wisdom" would more exactly express *λόγον σοφίας*: and there may be a question whether 'neglecting' is quite strong enough for *ἀφειδία,* whether 'punishing' or 'not sparing,' which are both suggested in the margin, would not, one or the other, have been well introduced into the text. But in the latter part of the verse, where its chief difficulties reside, our Translators leave us in some doubt as regards the exact meaning which the passage had for them. About the Geneva Version I have no doubt. Its authors, evidently under the leading of Beza, have seized the right meaning: "[yet are] of no value, [but appertain to those things] wherewith the flesh is crammed." At the same time, their version is too paraphrastic; the words which I have enclosed within brackets having no corresponding words in the original. Did our Translators mean the same thing? I am inclined to think not; else they would have placed a comma after 'honour;' but that rather they, in agreement with many of the best interpreters of their time, understood the verse thus: "Which things have a show of wisdom, &c., but are not in any true honour, as things which serve to the satisfying of the just needs of the body." If this be, as I feel pretty sure

it is, their meaning, there may be urged against it that πλησμονή has a constant sense of filling *overmuch*, or stuffing (Isai. i. 14; Ps. cv. 16; Ezek. xvi. 48); and followed by σαρκός could scarcely have any other sense; it being impossible that σάρξ here can be used in an honourable intention and as equivalent to σῶμα, but only in the constant Pauline sense of the flesh and mind of the flesh as opposed to the spirit. Some rendering which should express what the Geneva Version expresses, but in happier and conciser terms, is that which should be aimed at here. "A golden sentence," as he calls it, which Bengel quotes from the Commentary of Hilary the Deacon on this passage, "Sagina carnalis sensûs traditio humana est," shows that this interpretation of it was not unknown in antiquity.

1 Tim. vi. 8.—"Having food and *raiment*, let us be therewith content." Would it not be better to translate, "Having food and *covering*, let us be therewith content"? It is possible that St. Paul had only raiment in his eye; and σκέπασμα is sometimes used in this more limited sense (Plato, *Polit.* 279 *d*); but seeing that it may very well include, and does very often include, habitation,[5] this more general word, which it would have been still free for those who liked to understand as 'raiment' alone, appears to me preferable. The Vulgate, which translates, "Habentes alimenta et *quibus tegamur*," and De Wette, 'Bedeckung,' give the same extent to the word.

Heb. ii. 16.—"For verily He *took not on Him the nature* of angels; but He took on Him the seed of Abraham." It is well known what a consent of ancient interpreters there was to the fact that this verse contained an

[5] Σκέπης διττὸν εἶδος, τὸ μὲν ἐσθής, τὸ δὲ οἰκία. Philo, *De Vit. Con.* § 4.

express allusion to the Incarnation; and our Translators are here only true to the universal exposition of their age. But there is almost an equally universal denial on the part of modern expositors that there is here any reference to the Incarnation, but only generally to the fact that Christ is a Helper of men and not of angels; Castellio being, I believe, the first who asserted that grammatically the other interpretation would not stand; and already we find in South a very clear statement of what may be said, and said justly, against the traditional exposition; though he himself, as it presently appears, is not prepared to let it go. I will quote the objections as he puts them, and will accept them, rather than the refutation of them which he afterwards supplies. "As for the words that I have here pitched upon, it must be confessed that the translation represents them very different from what they are in the original, which runs thus, *Οὐ γὰρ δήπου ἐπιλαμβάνεται τοὺς ἀγγέλους*—where we find that what we render by the preter tense 'He took,' the original has by the present, 'He takes;' and what we render, 'the nature of angels,' the original has only *τοὺς ἀγγέλους*, 'angelos.' Neither is it clear that 'to take on Him' or 'to assume' is the genuine signification of *ἐπιλαμβάνεται*. This text is generally used by divines, ancient and modern, to prove Christ's Incarnation, or assuming of the human nature; notwithstanding that this word *ἐπιλαμβάνεται* (as Camero well observes) is no where else in Scripture taken in this sense. St. Paul uses it in 1 Tim. vi. 19; but with him there it signifies 'to apprehend,' 'to attain,' or compass a thing. But its chief signification, and which seems most suitable to this place, is 'to rescue and deliver;' it being taken from the usual manner of rescuing a thing, namely, by catching hold of it, and so forcibly wringing it from

the adversary; as David, when he rescued the lamb from the bear and the lion's mouth, might be properly said ἐπιλαμβάνεσθαι. And Grotius observes that the proper sense of this word is, 'vindicare seu asserere in libertatem manu injectâ.'"[6]

Jam. iii. 5.—"Behold how great *a matter* a little fire kindleth!" This may be right. Our Translators have the high authority of St. Jerome on their side, who renders (*in Esai.* 66): "Parvus ignis quam grandem succendit *materiam*;" and compare Ecclus. xxviii. 10; yet certainly it is much more in the spirit and temper of this grand imaginative passage to take ὕλην here as 'wood' or 'forest:' "Behold, how great *a forest* a little spark kindleth!" So the Vulgate long ago: "Ecce quantus ignis quam magnam *silvam* incendit!" and De Wette: "Siehe, ein kleines Feuer, welch einen grossen *Wald* zündet es an!" It need hardly be observed how frequently in ancient classical poetry the image of the little spark setting the great forest in a blaze recurs—in Homer, *Il.* xi. 155, in Pindar, *Pyth.* iii. 66, and elsewhere; nor yet how much better this of the wrapping of some vast forest in a flame by the falling of a single spark sets out that which was in St. James's mind, namely, of a far-spreading mischief springing from a smallest cause, than does the vague sense which in our Version is attached to the word. Our Translators have placed 'wood' in the margin.

Rev. iii. 2.—"Strengthen *the things which remain*, that are ready to die." The better Commentators are now agreed that τὰ λοιπά, thus rendered "*the things* which remain," should be taken rather as = τοὺς λοιποὺς, and that the Angel of the Sardian Church is not bidden,

[6] *Sermons*, vol. viii. p. 272.

as we generally understand it, to strengthen the graces that remain in his own heart, but the few and feeble believers that remain in the Church over which he presides; the allusion being probably to Ezek. xxxiv. 2. Vitringa: "Commendat vigilantiam, quâ sibi a morte caverent, et alios ab interitu imminente vindicarent." The use of the neuter, singular and plural, where not things but persons are intended, is too frequent in the New Testament, to cause any difficulty (Winer, *Gramm.* § 27. 4), and may have a very deep significance here, where it designates an inert and well-nigh lifeless mass.

CHAPTER X.

ON SOME INCORRECT RENDERINGS OF WORDS AND PASSAGES.

OUR Translators occasionally fail in part or altogether to give the true force of a word or a passage. In some cases it is evident they have assumed a wrong etymology. These are examples:—

Matt. viii. 20.—"The birds of the air have *nests*." It stood thus in the versions preceding; the Vulgate in like manner has 'nidos;' but some of the earlier Latin versions, 'diversoria,' and Augustine, using one of these, has 'tabernacula,'[1] and these, with their equivalent English, are on all accounts the preferable renderings. For in the first place birds do *not* retire to their 'nests,' except at one brief period of the year; and then secondly, κατασκηνώσεις will not bear that meaning; or at all events has so much more naturally the more general meaning of shelters, habitations ('latibula,' 'cubilia;' 'Wohnungen,' De Wette), that one must needs agree with Grotius, who here remarks: "Quin vox hæc ad arborum ramos pertineat, dubitaturum non puto qui loca infra, xiii. 32, Marc. iv. 32, et Luc. xiii. 19, inspexerit."[2] He might have added to these, Ps. civ. 12; Dan. iv. 18, LXX.

---

[1] *Quæst. xvii. in Matt.*, qu. 5.

[2] See an excellent note in Fischer, *De Vitiis Lex. N. T.* p. 285.

Matt. x. 4; cf. Mark iii. 18.—"Simon *the Canaanite.*" I have often asked myself in perplexity what our Translators meant by this 'Canaanite;' which they are the first to use; although Cranmer's "Simon *of Canaan,*" and probably Tyndale's "Simon *of Canan,*" come to the same thing. Take 'Canaanite' in its obvious sense, and in that which every where else in the Scripture it possesses (Gen. xii. 6; Exod. xxv. 28; Zech. xiv. 21; and continually), and the word would imply that one of the Twelve, of those that should sit on the twelve thrones judging the tribes of Israel, was himself not of the seed of Abraham, but of that accursed stock, which the children of Israel, going back from God's commandment, had failed utterly to extirpate on their entrance into the Promised Land; and which, having thus been permitted to live, had gradually been absorbed into the nation. This of course could not be; to say nothing of the word which they had before them being *Καναν*ί*της*, and not *Χαναναῖος*, as would have been necessary to justify the rendering of the Authorized Version. There can be no doubt that *Κανανίτης* here is = *ζηλωτής*, Luke vi. 15; Acts i. 13; and expresses the fact that Simon had been, before he joined himself to the Lord, one of those stormy zealots who, professing to follow the example of Phineas (Num. xxv. 9), took the vindication of God's outraged law into their own hands. There is, indeed, another explanation sometimes given of the word; but the manner in which our Translators have spelt the word will hardly allow one to suppose that they adopted this, and by 'Canaanite' meant, "of Cana," the village in Galilee. This is Jerome's view, and I suppose Beza's ('Cananites'), and De Wette's ('der Kananit'); yet *Κανά* would surely yield, not *Κανανίτης*, but *Κανίτης*, as *Ἄβδηρα*, *Ἀβδηρίτης*. I confess myself wholly at a loss to understand the

intention of our Translators; for the reading *Καναναῖος*, which Tischendorf and Lachmann have introduced into their text, hardly known when they wrote, could certainly have exercised no influence upon them,—except indeed through the 'Chananæus' of the Vulgate.

Matt. xiv. 8.—"And she, *being before instructed* of her mother, said, Give me here John Baptist's head in a charger." A meaning is given here to *προβιβασθεῖσα*, which it will not bear; but to which the 'præmonita' of the Vulgate may have led the way. *Προβιβάζειν* is to urge on, or push forward, to make to advance, or sometimes, intransitively, to advance; the *πρό* not being of time, but of place; thus *προβιβάζειν τὴν πατρίδα*, to set forward the might of one's country (Polybius, ix. 10, 4); and it is sometimes used literally, sometimes figuratively. On the one other occasion when it occurs in the New Testament, it is used literally; *προεβίβασαν Ἀλέξανδρον* (Acts xix. 33), "they *pushed forward* Alexander," not, as in our Version, "they *drew out* Alexander;" here figuratively and morally. We may conceive the unhappy girl, with all her vanity and levity, yet shrinking from the petition of blood which her mother would put into her lips, and needing to be urged on, or pushed forward, before she could be induced to make it; and this is implied in the word. I should translate, "And she, *being urged on* by her mother."

Matt. xiv. 13.—"They followed Him *on foot* out of the cities." *Πεζῇ* might very well mean "on foot;" yet it does not mean so here; but rather, "by land." There could be no question that the multitude who followed Jesus would in the main proceed "on foot," and not in chariots or on horses, and it is not this which the Evangelist desires to state. The contrast which he would draw

is between the Lord who reached the desert place *by ship* (see the earlier part of the verse), and the multitude who found their way thither *by land*. Compare the use of πεζεύειν at Acts xx. 13, by the Rheims rightly translated, "to journey by land;" but in our Translation, not with the same precision, "to go afoot."

Matt. xxiii. 24.—"Which strain *at* a gnat, and swallow a camel." This has often been found fault with. Long ago Bishop Lowth complained, "The impropriety of the preposition has wholly destroyed the meaning of the phrase." Yet it may well be a question here whether the inaccuracy complained of lies at the door of the Translators or the printers. For myself, I feel strongly convinced that we have here a misprint, which having been passed over in the first edition of 1611, has held its ground ever since; and that our Translators intended, "which strain *out* a gnat, and swallow a camel;" this being at once intelligible, and a correct rendering of the original; while our Version, as at present it stands, is neither; or only intelligible on the supposition, no doubt the supposition of most English readers, that "strain *at*" means, swallow with difficulty, men hardly and with effort swallowing the little insect, but gulping down meanwhile, unconcerned, the huge animal. It need scarcely be said that this is very far from the meaning of the original words, οἱ διϋλίζοντες τὸν κώνωπα, by Meyer rendered well, "percolando removentes muscam;" and by the Vulgate also not ill, "excolantes culicem;" for which use of διϋλίζειν, as to cleanse by passing through a strainer, see Plutarch, *Symp.* vi. 7. 1. It was the custom of the more accurate and stricter Jews to strain their wine, vinegar, and other potables through linen or gauze, lest unawares they should drink down some little unclean insect therein, and thus transgress Lev. xi..

20, 23, 41, 42—just as the Buddhists do now in Ceylon and Hindostan—and to this custom of theirs the Lord refers. A recent traveller in North Africa writes in an unpublished communication which he has been good enough to make to me—"In a ride from Tangier to Tetuan I observed that a Moorish soldier who accompanied me, when he drank, always unfolded the end of his turban and placed it over the mouth of his *bota*, drinking through the muslin, to strain *out* the *gnats*, whose larvæ swarm in the water of that country." The further fact that our present Version rests to so great an extent on the three preceding, Tyndale's, Cranmer's, and the Geneva, and that all these have "strain *out*," is additional evidence in confirmation of that about which for myself I feel no doubt, namely, that we have here an unnoticed, and thus uncorrected, error of the press; which yet, having been once allowed to pass, yielded or seemed to yield some sort of sense, and thus did not provoke and challenge correction, as one making sheer nonsense would have done. There was no such faultless accuracy in the first edition, as should make us slow to admit this; on the contrary, more than one mistake which had in the exemplar edition of 1611 been passed over, was subsequently discovered and removed. Thus it stood there, at 1 Cor. iv. 9, "God hath set forth us the apostles last, as it were *approved* to death;" yet 'approved' was afterwards changed for the word no doubt intended, 'appointed.' In another passage, I mean 1 Cor. xii. 28, the misprint "helps *in* governments," after having retained its place in several successive editions, was afterwards in like manner removed, and the present correcter reading, "helps, governments" (ἀντιλήψεις, γυβερνήσεις), substituted in its room.

Mark xi. 4.—"*A place where two ways met.*" Ἄμφοδος (ἀμφί and ὁδός) is rather, a way round, a crooked lane.

Mark xii. 26.—"Have ye not read in the book of Moses, how *in the bush* God spake unto him?" But ἐπὶ τῆς βάτου, as all acknowledge now, is not, "in the bush," as indicating the place from which God spake to Moses, but means, "in that portion of Scripture which goes by the name of The Bush"—the Jews being wont to designate different portions of Scripture by the most memorable thing or fact recorded in them; thus one portion was called ἡ βάτος. How, indeed, to tell this story in the English Version is not easy to determine, without forsaking the translator's sphere, and entering into that of the commentator. I may observe that ἐν Ἠλίᾳ (Rom. xi. 2) is a quotation of the same kind. It can never mean, "of Elias," as in our Translation; but is rather, "in the history of Elias," in that section of Scripture which tells of him; so De Wette: "in der Geschichte des Elia."

Acts xiv. 13.—"We also are *men of like passions* with you." This fact would not have disproved in the eyes of these Lycaonians the right of Paul and Silas to be considered gods. The heathen were only too ready to ascribe to their gods like passions, revenge, lust, envy, with their own. Ὁμοιοπαθεῖς ὑμῖν means rather, "subject to like conditions," that is, of pain, sickness, old age, death, "with yourselves." Translate, "We also are *men who suffer like things* with yourselves." The Vulgate, "Et nos *mortales* sumus," is on the right track; and Tyndale, "We are *mortal men* like unto you." The only other passage in the New Testament in which ὁμοιοπαθής occurs (Jam. v. 17), will need to be slightly modified in the same sense.

Acts xvii. 22.—"I perceive that in all things ye are *too superstitious*." This, as Luther's "allzu abergläubisch," is a rendering very much to be regretted. Whatever se-

vere things St. Paul might be obliged to say to his hearers, yet it was not his way to begin by insulting, and in this way alienating them from himself, and from the truth of which he was the bearer. Rather, if there was any thing in them which he could praise, he would praise that, and only afterwards condemn that which demanded condemnation. So is it here; he affirmed, and no doubt they took it for praise, that by his own observation he had gathered they were ὡς δεισιδαιμονεστέρους, as men greatly addicted to the worship of deities, "very religious," as I should render it, giving to 'religious' its true sense, and not the mischievous sense which it has now acquired. So Beza, 'religiosiores;' and De Wette, "sehr gottesfürchtig." This was the praise which all antiquity gave to the Athenians, and which Paul does not withhold, using at the same time with the finest tact and skill a middle word, capable of a good sense, and capable of a bad—a word originally of honourable meaning, but which had already slipped in part into a dishonourable sense; thus finely insinuating that this service of theirs might easily slip, or have slipped already, into excess, or might be rendered to wrong objects. Still these words are to be taken not as a holding up to them of their sin, but as a *captatio benevolentiæ*, and it must be confessed they are coarsely rendered in our Version.

Acts xxv. 5.—"Let them, therefore, said he, *which* among you *are able*, go down." But οἱ δυνατοί is not "those which are able," but "those which are in authority," as the Vulgate rightly, "qui potentes sunt:" see Lösner, *Obss. in N. T.* in loco.

Rom. ii. 22.—"Thou that abhorrest idols, *dost thou commit sacrilege?*" This is too general, and fails to bring out with sufficient distinctness the charge which the Apos-

tle in this ἱεροσυλεῖς is making against the Jew. The charge is this: "Thou professest to abhor idols, and yet art so mastered by thy covetousness, that, if opportunity offers, thou wilt not scruple thyself to lay hands on these gold and silver abominations, and to make them thy own" (see Chrysostom in loco). Read, "Thou that abhorrest idols, *dost thou rob temples?*"

Rom. xi. 8.—"According as it is written, God hath given them the spirit *of slumber*." Our Translators must have derived κατάνυξις from νυστάζειν, as indeed many others have done, before they could have given it this meaning. Yet they plainly have their misgiving in respect of the correctness of this etymology, for they propose 'remorse' in the margin, evidently on the correcter hypothesis that the word is not from νυστάζειν, but νύσσειν. Still, even if they had put 'remorse,' as the *compunction* of the soul (the Vulgate has 'compunctio'), into the text, though they would have been etymologically right, they would not have seized the exact force of κατάνυξις, at least in Hellenistic Greek; as is plain from the service which it does in the Septuagint (Isai. xxix. 10; Ps. lix. 3), and from the Hebrew words which it is there made to render. This is no place for entering at length into all (and it is much), which has been written on this word. Sufficient to say that it is properly the stupor or stupefaction, the astonishment, bringing 'astonishment' back to its stronger and earlier meaning, the stunnedness ('Betäubung,' De Wette) consequent on a wound or blow, νύσσειν, as I need hardly observe, being 'to strike' as well as 'to pierce.' 'Torpor,' only that this so easily suggests the wrong etymology, and runs into the notion of deep sleep, would not be a bad rendering of it. 'Stupor,' which the "Five Clergymen" have adopted, is perhaps better. Hammond,

whose marginal emendations of the Authorized Version are often exceedingly valuable, and deserve more attention than they have received, being about the most valuable part of his *Paraphrase and Annotations upon the New Testament,* has suggested 'senselessness;' but this is not one of his happiest emendations.

Gal. i. 18.—"I went up to Jerusalem *to see* Peter." Ἱστορεῖν is not merely 'to see,' but properly, to inquire, to investigate, to interrogate, to arrive by personal knowledge, ocular or other, at the actual knowledge of past events: and then, secondarily, to set down the results of these investigations, just as ἱστορία is first this investigation, and then, in a secondary sense, the result of it duly set down, or, as we say, 'history.' Here indeed it is a person, and not things, which are the object of this closer knowledge. "I went up to Jerusalem," says Paul, "*to acquaint myself with* Peter" ("accuratius cognoscere; itaque plus inest quam in verbo ἰδεῖν:" Winer).

Gal. v. 19, 20.—"The works of the flesh are manifest, . . . *seditions.*" It is at first perplexing to find this as the rendering of διχοστασίαι, which is evidently a word of wider reach; but Archdeacon Hare has admirably accounted for its appearance in this place.[3] I will quote his words: "When our Version is inaccurate or inadequate, this does not arise, as it does throughout in the Rhemish Version, from a coincidence with the Vulgate; yet its inadequate renderings often seem to have arisen from an imperfect apprehension of some Latin substitute for the word in the Greek text,—from taking some peculiar sense of the Latin word different from that in which it was used

[3] *Mission of the Comforter,* p. 391.

to represent the Greek original. Let me illustrate this by a single instance. Among the works of the flesh St. Paul (Gal. v. 20) numbers διχοστασίαι, which we render 'seditions.' But 'seditions' in our old, as well as our modern language, are only one form of the divisions implied by διχοστασίαι, and assuredly not the form which would present itself foremost to the Apostle's mind when writing to the Galatians. At first, too, one is puzzled to understand how the word 'seditions' came to suggest itself in the place, instead of the more general term 'divisions,' which is the plain correspondent to διχοστασίαι, and is so used in Rom. xvi. 17, and in 1 Cor. iii. 3. Here the thought occurs that the Latin word 'seditio,' though in its ordinary acceptation equivalent to its English derivative, yet primarily and etymologically answers very closely to διχοστασία; and one is naturally led to conjecture that our Translators must have followed some Latin version, in which the word 'seditiones' was used, not without an affectation of archaic elegance. Now the Vulgate has 'dissensiones,' but in Erasmus, whose style was marked by that characteristic, we find the very word 'seditiones.' Hence Tyndale, whom we know from his controversial writings to have made use of Erasmus' version, took his 'sedition,' not minding that the sense in which Erasmus had used the Latin word, was alien to the English; and from Tyndale it has come down, with a mere change of number, into our present Version; while Wiclif and the Rhemish render the Vulgate by 'dissensions.'"

Ephes. iv. 29.—"Let no corrupt communication proceed out of your mouth, but that which is good *to the use of edifying.*" But to justify these last words, to which Beza's "ad ædificationis usum" may have led the way, we should have found, not πρὸς οἰκοδομὴν τῆς χρείας; but

πρὸς or εἰς χρείαν τῆς οἰκοδομῆς. No one will affirm that we have such an hypallage here. There is much more in the words than such a translation, even were it allowable, would educe from them. It is not very easy to give, without circumlocution, a satisfactory English rendering; but the meaning is abundantly clear. "Let such discourse," St. Paul would say, "proceed from your mouths as is profitable to the present emergent need or occasion; do not deal in vague, flat, unmeaning generalities, which would suit a thousand other cases equally well, and probably, therefore, equally ill; let your words be what the words of wise men will always be, nails fastened in a sure place, words suiting the present time and the present person, being *for the edifying of the occasion.*" "Edification of the need," Ellicott has it; and De Wette, "zur Erbauung nach Bedürfniss." An admonition of a similar character is couched in the εἰδέναι πῶς δεῖ ἑνὶ ἑκάστῳ ἀποκρίνεσθαι of the parallel passage in the Colossians (iv. 6). Not so much "*every* man," as our Version has it, but "*each* one" (εἷς ἕκαστος), must have his own answer, that which meets *his* difficulties, *his* perplexities. There must not be *one* unfeeling, unsympathizing, unvarying answer for all.

Phil. iv. 3.—"And I entreat thee also, true yokefellow, help *those* women which laboured with me in the Gospel, with Clement also." The alteration which this passage requires is exceedingly slight. Let only 'those' be changed into 'these,' and a comma be placed after 'women,' and, then the close connexion of this verse with the verse preceding, most necessary for its right understanding, will plainly appear, and otherwise it will render up its sense clearly, which now it can hardly be affirmed to do. St. Paul has in that verse besought two faithful women in the

Philippian Church, very probably deaconesses, Euodias[4] and Syntyche, between whom some difference had arisen, to lay this aside, and to be again "of the same mind in the Lord." He now turns to one who, from some cause or other, was eminently fitted to be a peacemaker between these two, and addressing him as "true yokefellow," as one made to be a knitter together again of the loosened bonds or yokes of love, exhorts him to "help *these* women," that is, to help them in a coming together again,—that he should remove all obstacles and hindrances to this; and the Apostle finds a motive to this exhortation, a reason why this "true yokefellow" should be at pains herein, namely, *because* these two (observe αἵτινες = "quippe quæ") had laboured with himself and others in the Gospel, and had both of them well deserved by these labours of love, that they should not be left with any discord or dissension between them, if Christian help could remove this. Let this third verse be read with these slight alterations here proposed, and its meaning is sufficiently clear.

Col. i. 15.—"Who is the image of the invisible God, *the first-born of every creature.*" This is one of the very few renderings in our Version which obscures a great doctrinal truth, and, indeed, worse than this, seems to play into the hands of Arian error. For does it not legitimately follow on this "first-born of every creature," or "of all creation," that He of whom this is predicated must be Himself also a creature, although the first in the creation of God? But in the phrase πρωτότοκος πάσης κτί-

[4] I should prefer 'Euodia,' as it is in the Geneva Version, which would mark more clearly that it is a woman's name. Hammond, missing the fact that we have here to do with women at all, would change, on the contrary, 'Syntyche' into 'Syntyches.'

σεως, we are not to regard πάσης κτίσεως as a partitive genitive, so that Christ is included in the "every creature," though distinguished as being the first-born among them, but rather as a genitive of comparison, depending on, and governed by, the πρῶτος (see John i. 15, 30) which lies in πρωτότοκος. I am not quite satisfied with "born before every creature," or "brought forth before every creature;" because there lies in the original words a comparison between the begetting of the Son and the creation of the creature, and not merely an opposition; He is placed at the head of a series, though essentially differing from all that followed in the fact that He was born and they only created; the great distinction between the γεννᾶν (or τίκτειν, as it is here) and the κτίζειν, which came so prominently forward in the Arian controversy, being here already marked. Still I could have no question as between it and the "first-born of every creature" of our Version, which obviously suggests an erroneous meaning, though it may be just capable of receiving a right one. It was nothing strange that Waterland, who in the beginning of the last century fought the great battle of the English Church against the Arianism which claimed a right to exist in her very bosom, should have been very ill-content to find a most important testimony to that truth for which he was contending, forgone and renounced, so far at least as the English translation reached. Nor was this all; the verse was not merely taken away from him, but, in appearance at least, made over to his adversaries. He often complains of this, as in the following passage: "In respect of the words, 'first-born of every creature' comes not up to the force or meaning of the original. It should have been "*born* (or begotten) *before the whole creation*," as is manifest from the context, which gives the reason why He

is said to be πρωτότοκος πάσης κτίσεως. It is because He is 'before all things,' and because by Him were all things created. So that this very passage, which, as it stands in our Translation, may seem to suppose the Son one of the creatures, does, when rightly understood, clearly exempt Him from the number of creatures. He was before all created being, and consequently was Himself *uncreated*, existing with the Father from all eternity."[5]

1 Tim. iv. 1, 2, 3.—"In the latter times some shall depart from the faith, giving heed to seducing spirits, and doctrines of devils; speaking lies in hypocrisy; having their conscience seared with a hot iron; forbidding to marry." It is difficult to say exactly how our Translators intended here to deal with their original. There is one very obvious meaning to give to their version, that which almost every English reader does give; but one which involves a greater, and yet more obvious error, than one is disposed to lay at their door. Mede, however, in a passage which I quote, but abridge in quoting, does not shrink from ascribing this to them. Yet I quote him here, not so much for his criticism of what they have done, or what he supposes them to have done, as because he himself deals with the passage in the only right way. Speaking of our Version, he says, "The syntax of the words in the Greek is uncapable of such a construction; for the persons intimated in the former verse are expressed *in casu recto*, as τινὲς προσέχοντες, but the persons intended here (ver. 2) we find in the genitive, ψευδολόγων κ.τ.λ., which cannot agree with τινές and προσέχοντες.[6] They

[5] *Serm.* 2, *Christ's Divinity proved from Creation.*

[6] Another inconvenience he does not mention, that the seduced and the seducers in the Church would thus be confounded.

would indeed agree with δαιμονίων, but that would be a harsh sense every way; for either we must say, as some do, that by 'devils' are meant devilish men, which is an hard signification, or else it would be a stranger sense to say that devils should lie, have seared consciences, or forbid marriage or meats; so that Beza and others had rather confess a breach of syntax than incur the inconvenience of such a forced sense. But what needs this, so long as there is a better way to solve it? namely, to make all these genitives to be governed of ἐν ὑποκρίσει. I see no way but this to keep the syntax true and even, and wholly to avoid the forementioned inconveniences. As for the use of the preposition ἐν, to signify *causam, instrumentum,* or *modum actionis,* he that is not a stranger to the Scripture knows it to be most frequent, the Greek text borrowing it from the use of the Hebrew preposition ב; cf. Matt. v. 13; Acts xvii. 31; Tit. i. 9; 2 Pet. iii. 1; 2 Thess. ii. 9, 10; so in my text, ἐν ὑποκρίσει ψευδολόγων κ.τ.λ., this was the manner, means, and quality of the persons whereby the doctrine of demons was first brought in, advanced, and maintained in the Church, namely, through the hypocrisy of those who told lies, of those who had their consciences seared, &c."[7]

Heb. xi. 29.—"Which the Egyptians essaying to do, *were drowned.*" Did our Translators prefer the reading κατεποντίσθησαν? This is not very probable, the authority for it being so small. If they did not, and if they read, as is most likely, κατεπόθησαν, they should have rendered it by some word of wider reach; as, for instance, "were swallowed up," or, "were engulphed" ("devorati

[7] *Apostasy of the Latter Times,* part ii. c. i.

sunt," Vulgate; "verschlungen wurden," Bleek). "Swallowed up," besides being nearer the original, would more accurately set forth the historic fact. The pursuing armies of the Egyptians sunk in the sands quite as much as they were overwhelmed by the waves of the Red Sea, as is expressly declared in the hymn of triumph which Moses composed on the occasion; *κατέπιεν αὐτοὺς γῆ*, Exod. xv. 12; cf. Diodorus Siculus, i. 32, *ὑπ' ἄμμον καταπίνεται*.

Jam. i. 26.—"If any man among you *seem to be* religious, and bridleth not his tongue, but deceiveth his own heart, this man's religion is vain." This verse, as it here stands, cannot but have perplexed many. How, it has been asked, can a man "*seem to be* religious," that is, present himself to others as such, when his religious pretensions are belied and refuted by the allowance of an unbridled tongue? But the perplexity has been introduced by our Translators, who have here failed to play the part of accurate synonymists, and to draw the line sharply and distinctly between the verbs *δοκεῖν* and *φαίνεσθαι*. *Δοκεῖν* expresses the subjective mental opinion of any thing which men form, their *δόξα* about it, which may be right (Acts xv. 28; 1 Cor. iv. 9), or which may be wrong (Matt. vi. 7; Mark vi. 49; Acts xxvii. 13); *φαίνεσθαι* the objective external appearance which it presents, quite independent of men's conception about it. Thus, when Xenophon writes, *ἐφαίνετο ἴχνια ἵππων* (*Anab.* i. 6, 1), he would affirm that horses had been actually there, and left their tracks. Had he employed the alternative word, it would have implied that Cyrus and his company took for tracks of horses what might have been, or what also very possibly might not have been, such at all. "*Δοκεῖν* cernitur in opinione, quæ falsa esse potest et vana. Sed *φαίνεσθαι* plerumque est in

re extra mentem; quamvis nemo opinatur."[8] Apply this distinction to the passage before us; keep in mind that δοκεῖν, and not φαίνεσθαι, is the word used, and all is plain: "If any man among you *think himself* religious ("se putat religiosum esse," Vulgate), and bridleth not his tongue, &c." It is his own subjective estimate of his spiritual condition which is here expressed, an estimate which the following words declare to be entirely erroneous. —Let me observe here that the same rendering of δοκεῖν, Gal. ii. 6, 9, lends a colour to St. Paul's words which is very far from being justly theirs. As we read in English, we seem to detect a certain covert irony upon his part in regard of the pretensions of the three great Apostles whom he met at Jerusalem ("who *seemed to be* something"—"who *seemed to be* pillars"). There is in fact nothing of the kind: he expresses, not what they *seemed* or appeared, but what they by others were, and were rightly, *held to be*. The Geneva having, "which are in estimation"—"which are taken to be pillars"—is here, as so often, correct; correct also, it will be observed, in making δοκοῦντες in both these verses a present, and not an imperfect, participle.

1 Pet. iii. 16.—"Having a good conscience, that *whereas* they speak evil of you as of evil doers, they may be ashamed that falsely accuse your good conversation in Christ." For 'whereas' (ἐν ᾧ) substitute 'wherein.' The correction is not trivial; but brings out the exact point of St. Peter's admonition, which we now miss. It is this: Not the doctrine, but the moral walk and conversation of the Christians, was the special object against which the calumnies of the heathen were directed,[9] as, for instance,

---

[8] Vömel, *Synonymische Wörterbuch*, p. 207.

[9] "Quos *per flagitia* invisos vulgus Christianos vocabat." Tacitus.

all manner of hideous reports were afloat in regard of what they did in their secret assemblies. Now, says the Apostle, in that very matter *in which* (ἐν ᾧ) they calumniate you the most, put them in that most manifestly to an open and wholesome shame, even in your walk, by the blameless innocency and purity of your conversation in the world: "ut *in eo* quod detrahunt vobis confundantur" (Vulg.). At ch. ii. 12, precisely the same emendation will need to be made. There indeed 'wherein' is suggested in the margin.

Jude 12.—"Trees *whose fruit withereth.*" But φθινοπωρινός has here a meaning ascribed to it, which it nowhere possesses, as though it were = ὠλεσίκαρπος, the φθινόκαρπος of Pindar, *Pyth.* iv. 265; or the 'frugiperdus' of Pliny. The φθινόπωρον is the late autumn, the autumn far spent, which succeeds the ὀπώρα, or the autumn contemplated as the time of the ripened fruits of the earth; and which has its name παρὰ τὸ φθίνεσθαι τὴν ὀπώραν, from the waning away of the autumn and the autumn fruits, themselves also often called the ὀπώρα; and φθινοπωρινός is always used in the sense of belonging to the late autumn. The Latin language has no word which distinguishes the later autumn from the earlier, and therefore the "arbores *autumnales*" of the Vulgate is a correct translation, and one as accurate as the language would allow, unless, indeed, it had been rendered, "arbores *senescentis autumni*," or by some such phrase; as De Wette in his German translation has it, '*spät*herbstliche.' We, I think, could scarcely get beyond "*autumnal* trees," or "trees *of autumn*," as the Rheims version gives it. These deceivers are likened by the Apostle to trees as they show in late autumn, when foliage and fruit alike are gone. Bengel: "Arbor tali specie qualis est autumno extremo,

sine foliis et pomis." The *φθινοπωρινά, ἄκαρπα,* will then, in fact, mutually complete one another: "without leaves, without fruit." Tyndale, who throws together *δένδρα φθινοπωρινὰ ἄκαρπα,* and renders the whole phrase thus, "trees without fruit *at gathering time,*" was feeling after, though he has not grasped, the right translation.

CHAPTER XI.

ON SOME CHARGES UNJUSTLY BROUGHT AGAINST THE AUTHORIZED VERSION.

THERE are certain charges which have been brought, and some of them are still repeated, against our Translation, of the injustice of which I feel deeply convinced. I do not now allude to charges which have been already noticed, and which testify to a want of familiarity on the part of those who make them with the changes which the English language, since the time when our Version was published, has undergone. Those on which I now would say something are of quite a different kind. They move in quite a different sphere, are of a far more serious character, and indeed touch so nearly the honour and good faith of the authors of our Version, that they can hardly be passed over without observation. Our Translators, then, are accused, as is familiar to many, of a deceitful handling of the Word of God, of snatching at unfair advantages, gratifying their own leanings in regard both of doctrine and discipline, at the expense of that strict impartial accuracy which it is the prime duty of those holding their position of trust and confidence always to maintain, of slurring over passages of Scripture which seem to make for an adversary, or compelling others to bear a testimony in their own favour which, except on this undue compulsion, they would never have borne.

These charges may, for clearness and convenience sake, be divided under the following heads, which will include, if not all, yet all the more important accusations of this kind which have at any time been made.

1. Charges made by Roman Catholics that our Translators have compelled passages of Scripture to tell against Roman doctrine, which, fairly translated, would yield no such testimony against it; while they have weakened or destroyed the witness of other passages, which, were the Version a more honest one, would be found on the side of Rome, in the points at issue between her and the Reformed Church.

2. Charges, made chiefly in times past, by Protestant Dissenters in respect of such words as bear upon the points of Church government and discipline debated between them and us, such, for instance, as 'bishop,' 'church,' 'ordain,'—that we have not played true in respect of these, but have every where given a more ecclesiastical tone and colouring to the translation than, fairly and impartially rendered, it would have borne.

3. Charges made by Arminians, either within or without the Church, accusing our Translators of Calvinistic tendencies, out of which they have brought passages to bear on this controversy, and in their own sense, that have no proper reference to it at all;—have given, so to speak, an edge to some statements, and blunted the edge of others, according as these seemed to make for or against the scheme of doctrine which they favoured.

4. Charges made in modern times by Arians and Socinians, who affirm that our Version has put an undue emphasis on various passages bearing on the nature and dignity of the Son of God, has set Him forth in a manner which the original would not warrant as God in the very

highest sense of the word. To this is in general appended a further complaint, but one closely connected with the preceding, to the effect that sacrificial terms, as, 'propitiation,' 'atonement,' and the like, have been needlessly and unwarrantably brought in.

It will at once be seen that it would be totally impossible to enter into all the controversies which in these objections are stirred. Any exhaustive dealing with them would lead very far away from the main purpose of this book; while it would be much easier to open than to close the discussions in which it would thus become necessary to engage. Declining to plunge into these, all that I can pretend to do is to take one or two salient points under each of these heads, one or two of the imputations of unfairness most often made; to deal with these; and if they are capable of being satisfactorily set aside, to argue from this that it is at least probable that the others might be as successfully dealt with.

And first, in regard of the complaints made by the Roman Catholics. The most elaborate attack upon the Anglican Version from this quarter is contained in a work by Gregory Martin, a seminary priest, published in 1582,[1]—published therefore some thirty years *before* our

[1] The long title of the book is as follows: *A Discovery of the manifold Corruptions of the Holy Scriptures by the Heretics of our Day, specially by the English Sectaries, and of their foul dealing herein by partial and false Translations, to the advantage of their Heresies, in their English Bibles used and authorized since the Time of Schism.* Rheims, 1582. Fulke's *Defence of the Sincere and True Translation of the Holy Scriptures into the English Tongue*, published in London the year following, contains a sufficient reply to most of his cavils; in respect of sincerity, I think, to all. The most important work in

present Translation. It will naturally follow from this date that some of its charges are, as regards our Version, beside the mark, and do not touch it. So very much, however, of the earlier translations survives in our final revision, that in a vast number of instances they bear with the same force, or weakness, upon the Version as it stands now as they did upon its predecessors.

Let me here first observe, that it is very unreasonable to find fault with our Translators, that, in certain passages fairly capable of two renderings, one of which gave a stronger testimony in favour of what they believed to be the truth, or in condemnation of what they believed to be error, than the other, they should have adopted that which fell in with all their antecedent convictions; for instance, that at Heb. xiii. 4, they should incline to that interpretation, and adopt that rendering, which justified the abolition in the Reformed Church of the compulsory celibate of the clergy. The rendering of ἐν πᾶσι, "in all," *i.e.* "inter omnes" (a masculine and not a neuter), was open to them; it was the interpretation adopted by many of the ancient Fathers; grammatically it can be perfectly justified; it is accepted to the present day by many who are not in the least drawn to it by doctrinal, but purely by philological, interests, and it is certainly very idle to complain of them that they preferred it.

Setting then such passages aside, I will adduce one or two others of a different character. The first is one where this charge has been sometimes allowed by writers of our own communion. Thus, Professor Stanley is inclined to ascribe

---

later times is Ward's *Errata of the Protestant Bible*, Dublin, 1810. In addition to these, there are many hostile criticisms upon our Version scattered over various polemical works.

to "theological fear or partiality" that, in St. Paul's statement, "Whosoever shall eat this bread, *or* drink this cup of the Lord unworthily, shall be guilty of the body and blood of the Lord" (1 Cor. xi. 27), they have substituted 'and' for 'or.' I have no suspicion that they did this "in order to avoid the inference that the Eucharist might be received under one kind." In the first place, there is authority for 'and;' hardly, to my mind, sufficient authority, but so much that an eminent scholar, like Fritzsche, with no theological leaning on one side or the other, even now prefers it, and Lachmann has given it a place in his text. Moreover, such an inference from these words is so extravagantly absurd, so refuted by several other statements in this very chapter, that I cannot see how they should have cared to exclude it. Even had they been willing to sacrifice truth and honesty, they were under no temptation to do so. They probably accepted *καί* as the right reading.

Gal. v. 6.—"Faith *which worketh* by love." It was for a long time a favourite charge of the Romanists, even in the face of their own Vulgate, which rightly, "fides quæ per caritatem *operatur*," in the face too of the invariable use of *ἐνεργεῖσθαι* as a middle verb in the New Testament (Rom. vii. 5; 2 Cor. i. 6; iv. 12; Ephes. iii. 20; Jam. v. 16), that we had given to *ἐνεργουμένη* an active sense, when it ought to have a passive; and that we had done this, dreading lest there should be found here any support for their doctrine of the "fides formata," as the faith which justifies. They would have had the words translated, "faith which *is wrought on*," *i.e.* animated, stirred up, "by love." Other unfriendly critics have repeated the charge. There is no need, however, to refute it, as the later Roman Catholic expositors, Windischmann,

for instance,[2] have acknowledged the accuracy of our translation, have accepted it as the only true one; and thus implicitly allowed the injustice of this charge.

Indeed, it is not too much to say, that if, in the heat of earlier controversy, any shadow of unfair advantage might seem to have been taken by the first Protestant translators after the Reformation, those of King James's Bible were careful to forego and renounce every thing of the kind. Thus it was a complaint, and I cannot esteem it an unreasonable one, on the part of Roman Catholic assailants of our earlier versions,[3] that they rendered εἴδωλον, 'image,' and not 'idol;' and εἰδωλολάτρης, "worshipper of *images*," and not "worshipper of *idols*" or 'idolater;' in this way confounding the honour paid in the Roman Church to images with the idol-worship of heathenism. They urged that however we might reprobate and condemn the former, it was confessedly an entirely different thing from the latter; while yet our Translators went out of their way, and departed from the more natural rendering of εἴδωλον, for the purpose of including both under a common reproach; that indeed by such renderings as this, "How agreeth the temple of God with *images?*" (2 Cor. vi. 16), they suggested and helped forward the destruction of these in all the churches through the land. The complaint was a just one, and our last Translators seem to have so regarded it. They have nowhere employed the offensive term, but always used 'idolater' and 'idol.' Thus compare 1 Cor. x. 7; 1 John v. 21, in our Version, with the same in the earlier Anglican

---

[2] *Erklärung des Briefes an die Galater*, Mainz, 1843, p. 131.

[3] See Ward's *Errata of the Protestant Bible*, p. 63; compare Fulke's *Defence of the English Translation*, ch. iii. § 1.

versions; in the latter passage, indeed, the Geneva had anticipated this correction.

In respect of objections sometimes made by Dissenters against our Translation, it would be to little profit to make this an occasion of entering on the long controversies between the English Church, which has recognized Episcopal government as of divine intention and institution, and those bodies which deny this. In the main those bodies, in consenting, with no outward constraint upon them, to use the Authorized Version, have admitted that in this matter no very grievous wrong is done to them; nor, it must be owned, are there any loud complaints or charges of unfairness upon this score made at the present day. Still such do from time to time make themselves heard. I shall content myself with observing that, if not in all, yet in nearly all, those passages which are most objected to, we have merely followed versions preceding, and those not exclusively the Bishops' Bible or Cranmer's; but Tyndale's and the Geneva—neither of them with any very strong sympathy for our Church government. For instance, it was the Geneva, which had the credit of restoring 'Church' instead of 'congregation,' as the rendering of ἐκκλησία. Then, too, it has been often said, and the charge is by no means obsolete, that the translation of ἐπισκόπους by 'overseers' at Acts xx. 28, and not by 'bishops,' as elsewhere, is a flagrant piece of dishonesty; committed in the hope of in this manner obscuring the fact that there were many 'bishops' in the single Church of Ephesus, *ergo* that 'bishop' = 'presbyter.' But so clear is it that ἐπίσκοπος is here not the technical name of an office, but the expression of the fact of oversight, that Tyndale, Cranmer, Coverdale, the Geneva, had all so rendered it before. Again, what "party zeal" was at work when ἐπισκοπή

was rendered 'bishopric' (Acts i. 20), or what we could hope to gain from this translation, it is difficult to see. 'Charge,' or some such word, would be preferable, for the same reason that ἐπίσκοπος (Acts xx. 28) is better rendered 'overseer' than 'bishop,' namely, because the word is not technical and official; but in employing 'bishopric' we did but retain the rendering of Wiclif, Tyndale, Coverdale, and Cranmer.

The complaint that there were Calvinistic, as against Arminian, leanings in our Translators, modifying, consciously or unconsciously, the rendering of various passages, differs from all other with which in this chapter I have to deal, that it is not urged exclusively by parties external to our Church, but proceeds quite as much and as often from those within it as from those without. This charge rests mainly, though not exclusively, on the three following places, Matt. xx. 23; Acts ii. 27; Heb. x. 38. It may be worth while to speak a few words severally upon each.

Matt. xx. 23.—"To sit on my right hand and on my left is not mine to give, *but it shall be given* to them for whom it is prepared of my Father." On this rendering, to which the Geneva version showed the way, Professor Scholefield does not scruple to say: "By foisting in the supernumerary words [it shall be given], we make the passage contain a doctrine directly contrary to other places of Scripture: *ex. gr.* John xvii. 2; Rev. iii. 21;" and Dr. Beard: "The Calvinism of the Geneva Version stands out here in bold relief."[4] And indeed this charge of something like bad faith in our rendering of this passage reaches very far back. It occupies a foremost place in the array of

[4] *Revision of the English Bible*, p. 309.

charges brought against our Version by Robert Gell.[5] "This translation," he complains, "makes our Lord abso-

[5] In the *Preface*, unpaged, but pp. 12-17, of his *Essay toward the Amendment of the last English Translation of the Bible*, folio; London, 1659. This work is chiefly remarkable as being the first—the first, at least, with which I am acquainted—which brings a series of accusations of deliberate mistranslation against the authors of our Version. The book, a folio of more than eight hundred pages, but containing exceedingly little on the subject which it professes to treat, and that little mainly having to do with the Old Testament, is not likely to be in the hands of many readers; but those who miss it have not missed much. Gell was a really learned man, but cross-grained, ill-tempered, in his reaction against Calvinistic excesses running into dangerous extremes on the other side; and his works, if the others may be judged by this sample, have their bushels of chaff with scarcely their grains of wheat. In proof, however, that he has the latter, I will quote here some objections which he makes against one passage in our Version, where certainly he has right and reason on his side. I allude to Heb. x. 34: "For ye . . . took joyfully the spoiling of your goods, *knowing in yourselves* that ye have in heaven a better and an enduring substance." He has right so far as he affirms that this translation might be bettered, that ἑαυτοῖς, or ἐν ἑαυτοῖς, should rather be construed with ἔχειν than with γινώσκοντες. "The words," he says, "are inverted and changed from the genuine order of them, which is extant in the Greek,—Γινώσκοντες ἔχειν ἑαυτοῖς κρείττονα ὕπαρξιν ἐν οὐρανοῖς καὶ μενοῦσαν, which I render thus: 'Knowing that ye have in yourselves better wealth in heaven, and that which will endure.' What a difference is here! That translation persuades men that they shall have hereafter in heaven a better kind of wealth. The true reading of these words supposes believers to have already a real possession of the better and more enduring substance in themselves; so that they take the spoiling of their outward goods with joy; . . . which order of words is wholly neglected by all the printed English translations that I have yet seen; and hereby the sense of the Holy Spirit is much obscured, which points at the present and real possession of the better and durable riches which 'Wisdom hath, and brings with her to the believing soul' (Prov. viii. 10)." All this is very good; but when Gell

lutely to deny that He hath any power to give the honour of sitting at his right hand and left; and so they rob the Lord Jesus of his regalia, his royalties, and those honours which He hath right and authority to bestow;" with some four pages more in the same style, aggravating the greatness of the offence which they have herein committed. Now I do not count it necessary to discuss the correctness or incorrectness of this rendering; I will only observe that such a scholar as the present Bishop of Ely, one certainly not supposed to have any Calvinistic leanings, after a full and careful consideration purely grammatical,[6] is disposed to leave the passage as it now stands, to supply, as our Translators have done, a δοθήσεται ἐκείνοις, and to reject the proposed emendation resting on the assumption that ἀλλά is here = εἰ μή. Meyer, who has certainly no doctrinal interest to overbear his philological, speaks with still greater decision on the matter: "Jesus weist hier die fragliche Bitte mit der unumwundenen Erklärung ab: die Verleihung des gebetenen gehöre zu den Reservaten Gottes: er der Messias habe diese Befugniss nicht."

Acts ii. 47.—"The Lord added to the Church daily *such as should be saved.*" It is urged against our Translators that in the original it is not τοὺς σωθησομένους, which would alone have justified this rendering; but τοὺς σωζομένους. Now admitting, which many scholars would refuse to do, that the Greek imperfect participle can never

---

goes on to affirm that the mistranslation was intentional, lest it might appear from the passage, rightly translated, that there was inherent righteousness in God's saints, which is a great point with him, this is only too much of a piece with the whole tone of his book.

[6] *The Text of the English Bible considered*, second edition, pp. 71-76.

have the force which is given to it here; admitting, I say, this, the explanation would still be sufficiently easy of their slight departure from an accurate rendering, without ascribing to them, or those who went before them in this translation, any undue dogmatic bias. They were perplexed with a language which spoke of those as already saved, who only became saved through being thus added to the Church of the living God. They probably did not clearly perceive that by this language the sacred historian meant to say that *in this act* of adherence to the Church, and to Christ its Head, these converts were saved, delivered from the wrath to come; "those that did escape," Hammond renders it. They had no wish, except to avoid a fancied difficulty, and I do not believe that the thought of predestination, least of all of predestination as involving reprobation, once entered into their minds, however others may have since employed the words as a support for the doctrine. Indeed, it is well worthy of note that the Rhemish version gives precisely the same future meaning to τοὺς σωζομένους, and renders, "they that should be saved."

Heb. x. 38.—"Now the just shall live by faith; but if *any man* draw back, my soul shall have no pleasure in him." Bishop Pearson[7] brings a charge of *mala fides* against Beza, the first who rendered ἐὰν ὑποστείληται, "si *quis* se subduxerit." But if bad faith in him, bad faith also in all who accepted from him this rendering of the words, and became accessories after the fact. The charge, not always in language quite so strong, reappears continually; no objection to the entire good faith of our Translators is indeed oftener urged. In our own times, Professor Blunt[8]

[7] *Minor Theological Works*, vol. ii. p. 264.

[8] *Duties of the Parish Priest*, p. 57.

has not hesitated to affirm that the doctrinal tendencies of our Translators exercised here an unwarrantable influence on their work. So too the present Bishop of Ely, who has a long and learned note upon the subject,[9] plainly thinks the case not a good one for any concerned in it. No unprejudiced person, it is said, can read the verse in the original, and not acknowledge that the person whose drawing back is supposed possible in the second clause of the verse is 'the just' of the first clause. So Tyndale had translated it: "But the just shall live by faith; and if *he* withdraw himself, &c.;" Coverdale and Cranmer in the same way. But this verse, so rendered, would have contradicted the doctrine of final perseverance; and therefore, it is said, in the Geneva version Beza's way of escape from this conclusion was eagerly grasped at, and 'any' there substituted for 'he,' and "any man" in our Version. Now I certainly myself think that *δίκαιος is* the nominative to *ὑποστείληται*, and that the passage does contradict the doctrine of final perseverance in its high Calvinistic or necessitarian shape. But to the present day, the other scheme of the verse, that namely of our Translation, which would disengage an *ἄνθρωπος* or a *τίς* from *δίκαιος*, and make *it* the nominative to *ὑποστείληται*, is maintained by scholars such as De Wette and Winer,[10] who are certainly as remote as well can be from any Calvinistic inclinations.

There is, lastly, the charge made by Arians and Unitarians. I will content myself here with urging the fact, that our Translators, so far from pushing advantages against

---

[9] *The Text of the English Bible considered.* Cambridge, 1833, pp. 78-86.

[10] *Gramm.* § 49. 2.

these too far, have, if they have erred any where, erred rather in the opposite extreme. One passage has already been dealt with, namely Col. i. 15, where they have thus fallen short of the force of their original. Two others present themselves to me, in one of which certainly, in the other probably, they have done the same.

The first of these is John v. 18: "Therefore the Jews sought the more to kill Him, because He not only had broken the Sabbath, but said also *that God was his Father* (πατέρα ἴδιον ἔλεγε τὸν Θεόν), making Himself equal with God." It is strange that our Translators, who have recognized in so many places the emphatic character of ἴδιος (as at Matt. xxv. 14; John i. 41; Tit. ii. 9; 1 Pet. iii. 1), in some of which it is very doubtful whether this recognition ought to have found place,[11] should have failed to recognize it here, where the whole context imperiously demands its recognition. Unless Christ had claimed that God was his *own* Father, in a special peculiar sense, not common to Him and to all men, or at least to Him and all the elect nation, what accusation of blasphemy could the Jews have founded upon this? for had not God challenged this name (Mal. i. 6), and prophets given it to Him? or how could the words which follow, "making Himself equal with God," which are evidently explanatory of the claim which He made, have fitted that vaguer and more general assertion of God as his Father? It is impossible to doubt that there is here on Christ's part an assertion that He was

[11] See Winer, *Gramm.* § 22. 7. Meyer demands that it shall *always* be considered emphatic, never equivalent to the 'proprius' of later Latin. Yet I cannot but see in this an example of that virtuosity, that pushing of matters to the extreme, which not unfrequently mars the exegesis of this very distinguished scholar.

God's *own* Son, his Son *by nature,* as others are his sons by adoption and grace. But this assertion does not come out in our Version with at all the clear distinctness which it has in the original.

The other passage is Tit. ii. 13: "Looking for that blessed hope and the glorious appearing *of the great God, and our Saviour Jesus Christ.*" This verse, thus punctuated, and this is the punctuation of the edition of 1611, namely, with a comma after 'God,' does not identify, but clearly distinguishes between, "the great God," that is the Father, and "our Saviour Jesus Christ." I shall not enter into the grammatical questions involved in this verse; they are admirably dealt with by Professor Ellicott, in loco, who shows that, while this of our Translators must always remain grammatically a possible rendering of the words, it is far more probable that they should be rendered so as to contain an explicit confession of the Godhead of the Son; even as they were taken to do by many of the great teachers of the early Church; namely, thus: "Looking for the blessed hope and glorious appearing of our great God and Saviour Jesus Christ." Modern editors of the Authorized Version have sought to arrive, so far as they could, at the same result, by abolishing the comma after "the great God." But this they have no right to do. The intention of the authors of our Version was plainly the other way; and unacknowledged revisions of this kind, even where we may think them made in the right direction, are altogether to be condemned.

I freely acknowledge that I have not in this chapter answered all, or nearly all, the objections which from these several quarters have been made against our Version; but I have endeavoured to show that some at least of those which are counted the strongest, and as such are oftenest

brought forward, are capable of being successfully rebutted; and would fain draw from this a conclusion that the spirit and temper in which this Translation was carried out was, in all its leading features, one of fairness, impartiality, and justice to all.

CHAPTER XII.

ON THE BEST MEANS OF CARRYING OUT A REVISION.

I HAVE thus endeavoured to make as just an estimate as I could of the merits, and, where such exist, of the defects, of our Authorized Version. In pointing out some of these last, I trust I have nowhere spoken a word inconsistent with the truest reverence for its authors, the profoundest gratitude to them for the treasure with which they have enriched the English Church. Such word I certainly have not intended to utter; and I can truly say, that if a close and minute examination of parts of their work reveals flaws which one had not suspected before, it also makes us conscious how infinite its merits are, discovers to us not a few of these whereof we had hitherto been only partially aware.

A few words in conclusion. They shall be,—first, on the difficulties and dangers which manifestly beset a revision; and, secondly, on the manner in which these, or some of these, might be best overcome.

Among these difficulties, I will not more than touch on that of the formation of a Greek text which the revised Version should seek to represent; and yet it is a difficulty of enormous magnitude, and lying at the very threshold of the work. Let it once be admitted that any change is to take place, and it will be clearly impossible to rest content with the text which our Translators used. Take

those cases where every critical edition of later times, and on overwhelming evidence, has preferred some other readings to theirs. Thus, could we, for instance, refuse to change "King *of saints*" into "King *of nations*," Rev. xv. 3? 'zeal' into either 'toil' or 'labour,' Col. iv. 13? "carried *about*" into "carried *away*," Heb. xiii. 9? "*an ass*" into "*a son*," Luke xiv. 5? "Why callest thou Me good?" into "Why askest thou Me about the good?" Matt. xix. 17? Nor are these cases of overwhelming evidence by any means the hardest. These settle themselves, leaving no ground of appeal on behalf of the displaced reading. But how determine where the authorities are at all nearly balanced? Shall it, for instance, be, "bore *with their manners* in the wilderness," or, "bore them *as a nurse* in the wilderness" (Acts xiii. 18)? "serving *the time*," or, "serving *the Lord*" (Rom. xii. 11)? 'Greeks,' or 'Grecians' (Acts xi. 20)? with many such problems more.

But these are not all. It is impossible but that other changes must find place, which would take many still more by surprise, and be far more offensive than any of these. Indeed no other alterations in the English Bible would at all startle and offend to the same degree as would those which must follow from a reconsideration and reconstitution of the Greek text; and this, even though it should be determined to make no single change which has not the consenting authority of *all* the critical editions in its favour. This much certainly, if this work is once taken in hand, could not be avoided; for none, it is to be hoped, would be so cowardly, so distrustful of God's cause if left in his own keeping, so ready to break down the distinctions between God's word and man's, or to snatch at and profit by unfair advantages,—as to suggest that passages, if once it was thoroughly made out that they did not belong to the

Word of God, or ought to be read in some other form, should yet be retained as they are; either because the people had become so used to them that a great outcry would ensue at the first discovery of their omission or alteration, or, more abjectly still, because they were serviceable for the stopping the mouth of some heretic. Every sense of honour revolts at this last suggestion. And yet it is not to be denied that the effect would be startling, when some verse with which men all their life long have been familiar was left out, as Acts viii. 37 must be; or when some phrase, which had seemed a most precious witness, a *dictum probans* for a central truth, was found now to be so modified as to bear this witness no longer: "the Church *of God,* which He hath purchased with his own blood," for instance, to be changed into "the Church *of the Lord,* &c." (Acts xx. 28);[1] or "*God* was manifest in the flesh" into "*who* was manifest in the flesh" (1 Tim. iii. 16).[2] But satisfying myself with merely indicating this difficulty, which presents itself at the very outset, I pass on to others.

We must never leave out of sight that for a great multitude of readers the English Version is not the translation of an inspired Book, but is itself the inspired Book. And so far, of course, as it is a perfectly adequate counterpart of the original, this is true; since the inspiration is not limited to those Hebrew or Greek words in which the Divine message was first communicated to men, but lives on in whatever words are a faithful and full representation of these; nay, in words which fall short of this, to the

[1] See Tregelles, *The Printed Text of the New Testament,* pp. 231, 234.

[2] Ibid. pp. 226-231.

extent of their adequacy. There, and there only, where any divergence exists between the original and the copy, the copy is less inspired than the original; indeed, is not, to the extent of that divergence, inspired at all. But these distinctions are exactly of a kind which the body of Christian people will not draw, will hardly understand when they are drawn by others. The English Bible is to them all which the Hebrew Old Testament, which the Greek New Testament, is to the devout scholar; and receives from them the same undoubting affiance. They have never realized the fact that the Divine utterance was not made at the first in those very English words which they read in their cottages, and hear in their church. Who will not allow that the little which this faith of theirs in their English Bible has in excess is nearly or quite harmless? that on the other hand, the harm would be incalculable, of any serious disturbance of this faith, supposing, as might only too easily happen, very much else to be disturbed with it?

Neither can I count it an indifferent matter that a chief bond, indeed the chiefest, that binds the English Dissenters to us, and us to them, would thus be snapt asunder. Out of the fact that Nonconformity had not for the most part fixed itself into actual and formal separation from the Church till some time after our Authorized Version was made, it has followed that when the Nonconformists parted from us, they carried with them this Translation, and continued to use and to cherish it, regarding it as much their own as ours. The Roman Catholics are, I believe, the only body in the country who employ a version of their own. With their exception, the Authorized Version is common ground for all in England who call themselves Christians, is alike the heritage of all.

But even if English Dissenters acknowledged the necessity of a revision, which I conclude from many indications that they do, it is idle to expect that they would accept such at our hands. Two things then might happen. Either they would adhere to the old Authorized Version, which is not indeed very probable; or they would carry out a revision, it might be two or three, of their own. In either case the ground of a common Scripture, of an English Bible which they and we hold equally sacred, would be taken from us; the separation and division, which are now the sorrow and perplexity and shame of England, would become more marked, more deeply fixed than ever. Then, further, while of course it would be comparatively easy to invite our brethren of the Episcopal Church in America to take share in our revision, yet many causes might hinder their acceptance of this invitation, or their acquiescence in the work as we found it expedient to do it. Thus the issue might only too easily be, that we should lose in respect of them also the common ground of one and the same Scripture, which we now possess. Such a loss, either in regard of the English Dissenters, or American Churchmen, would not be a slight one, nor one deserving to be regarded with indifference.

Another most serious consideration presents itself. Is it likely that one revision will satisfy? If conducted with moderation, it will probably leave much untouched, about which it will still be possible to raise a question. It cannot be but there will be some who will think the revision ought to have been carried much further, who will refuse to accept the compromise, which a revision in any case must prove.[3] Is it not inevitable that after a longer or shorter

[3] Upon this subject see some admirable remarks in an article,

period another revision, and on that another, will be called for? Will not in this way all sense of stability pass away from our English Scripture? And to look at a mere material fact—the Bibles in the hands of our people, in what agreement with one another, after a little while, will they be? It is idle to expect that the great body of our population will keep pace with successive changes, and provide themselves with the latest revision. Inability to meet the expense, or unwillingness to do so, or a love of the old to which they have grown accustomed, a forgone conclusion that the changes are for the worse, or that they are immaterial, lack of interest in the subject, will all contribute to hinder this. The inconveniences, and much more than inconveniences, of such a state of things assuredly will not be slight. This prospect, indeed, so little alarms the author of an article in the *Edinburgh Review*,[4] "On the State of the English Bible," that he proposes the institution of a permanent commission, which shall be always altering, always embodying in a new and improved edition the latest allowed results of Biblical criticism. It was startling enough to read somewhere else a proposal that the Authorized Version should be revised once in every fifty years; but this proposal, if one could suppose there was the slightest chance that it would be acceded to, is most alarming of all.

These are the main arguments, as it seems to me, against a revision of our Version. None will deny their weight. Indeed, there are times when the whole matter

---

"Revision of the Authorized Version of the Bible," in the *Christian Remembrancer*, vol. xxxii. pp. 467 *sqq*. The discussion on the subject, and on the difficulties which it presents, is excellent throughout.

[4] October, 1855.

presents itself as so full of difficulty and doubtful hazard, that one could be well content to resign all gains that would accrue from this revision, and only ask that all things might remain as they are. But this, I am persuaded, is impossible: however we may be disposed to let the question alone, it will not let us alone. It has been too effectually stirred ever again to go to sleep; and the difficulties with which it is surrounded, be they few or many, will have at no distant day to be encountered. The time will come when the perils of remaining where we are will be so manifestly greater than the perils of action, that action will become inevitable. There will be danger in both courses, for that saying of the Latin moralist is a profoundly true one, "Nunquam periclum sine periclo vincitur;" but the lesser danger will have to be chosen; and that lesser danger will wait upon the course which I desire, not that the Church should now take, but should prepare herself for hereafter taking, should regard as one toward which we are inevitably approaching.[5]

In respect of the actual steps which it will be then advisable to take, I cannot think that, even when the matter is seriously undertaken, there should for a considerable time be any interference with the English text. Let come together, and if possible not of self-will, but with some authorization, royal or ecclesiastical, or both, such a body of scholars and divines as would deserve and would obtain the confidence of the whole Church. Fortunately,

[5] There is an interesting article in the *Theoll. Studien und Kritiken*, 1849, pp. 427 *sqq.*, with the title, "Die Bibel nach der deutschen Uebersetzung des D. Martin Luther," dealing with the same questions, in respect of the greatly honoured German translation of Luther, as agitate us in respect of our own.

no points at issue among ourselves threaten to come into discussion or debate; so that the unhappy divisions of our time would not here add any additional embarrassment to a matter embarrassed enough already. Nay, of such immense importance would it be to carry with us, in whatever might be done, the whole Christian people of England, that it would be desirable to invite all scholars, all who represented any important portion of the Biblical scholarship in the land, to assist with their suggestions here, even though they might not belong to the Church. Of course they would be asked as scholars, not as Dissenters. But it were a matter so deeply to be regretted, that they should revise, and we should revise, thus parting company in the one thing which now holds us strongly together, while it would be so hopeless, indeed so unreasonable, to expect that they should accept our revision, having themselves had no voice in it, that we ought not to stand on any punctilios here, but should be prepared rather to sacrifice every thing non-essential for the averting of such a catastrophe. Setting aside, then, the so-called Baptists, who of course could not be invited, seeing that they demand not a translation of the Scripture, but an interpretation, and that in their own sense,[6] there are no matters of doctrine or even of discipline likely to come into debate, which should

[6] The author of a review, on the whole a courteous one, of this book in a Baptist journal, *The Freeman*, November 17, 1858, assures me that I am mistaken in supposing that the Baptists claim to substitute 'dip,' 'immerse,' or 'wash' for 'baptize' wherever it occurs in the New Testament. "Many scholars among us, indeed all the most eminent whom we happen to know, are altogether indisposed to alter the word." I find it hard to reconcile this with the fact, that in *their* Revision, that namely of the American Bible Union, 'baptize' is always changed into 'immerse,' and 'baptism' into 'immer-

render it impossible for such Dissenters as accept our doctrinal articles to take a share in this work,—as regarded not from its ecclesiastical, but its scholarly point of view. All points likely to come under discussion would be points of pure scholarship, or would only involve that universal Christianity common to them and us; or if more than this, they would be points about which there is equally a difference of opinion within the Church as in the bodies without it, for instance, as between Arminian and Calvinist, which difference would not be avoided by their absence.

Let, then, such a body as this, inspiring confidence at once by their piety, their learning, and their prudence, draw out such a list of emendations as are lifted beyond all doubt in the eye of every one whose voice has any right to be heard on the matter; eschewing all luxury of emendation, abstaining from all which is not of primary necessity, from much in which they might have fitly allowed themselves, if they had not been building on foundations already laid, and which could not without great inconvenience be disturbed—using the same moderation, and even the same self-denial here, which Jerome used in his revision of the Latin. Let them very briefly, but with just as much

sion,' and 'Baptist' into 'Immerser'! Thus in the Gospel of St. Mark alone, "John was *immersing* in the desert, and preaching the *immersion* of repentance," i. 4; "I indeed *immerse* you in water, but He will *immerse* you in the Holy Spirit," ver. 8; "The head of John the *Immerser*," vi. 25; "He that believeth and is *immersed* shall be saved," xvi. 16; and the same wherever I have examined it. The writer of this article has taken some offence at the phrase "so-called Baptists." Certainly none was intended; but only a protest, the shortest I could make, against being supposed to admit that they who assumed this name more realized the truth of baptism, or otherwise made more of it, than we do ourselves.

learned explanation as should be needful, justify these emendations, where they were not self-evident. Let them, if this should be their conviction, express their sense of the desirableness that these should at some future day be introduced into the received text, as bringing it into more perfect accord and harmony with the original Scriptures. Having done this, let them leave these emendations to ripen in the public mind, gradually to commend themselves to all students of God's holy Word. Supposing the emendations such as ought to, and would, do this, there would probably before very long be a general desire for their admission into the text; and in due time this admission might follow. All abrupt change would thus be avoided—all forcing of alterations on those not as yet prepared to receive them. That which at length came in would excite no surprise, no perplexity, no offence, or at most a very small amount of these, having already in the minds of many displaced that of which it now at length took openly the room.

It is indeed quite true that "no man having drunk old wine, straightway desireth new; for he saith, The old is better;" but it is on 'straightway' that the emphasis, in this saying of our Lord, must be laid. In those spiritual things to which He intended that we should transfer this saying, a man may, and will, if he is wise, after a while desire the new. It may have a certain unwelcome harshness and austerity at the first; the man may have to overcome that custom which is as a second nature, before he heartily affects it. But still, just as the Western Church accepted in a little Jerome's revision of the Latin Version, notwithstanding the opposition which it met at the first,[7]

[7] See Van Ess, *Geschichte der Vulgata*, Tübingen, 1824, pp. 109-145.

and even the uproar and extreme confusion in the churches which its first introduction would sometimes cause, when some novelty took the place of a reading with which all were familiar; or, to come nearer home, just as our ancestors grew gradually in love with our present Translation, Churchmen weaning themselves from the Bishops' Bible, and Puritans from the Geneva,—as one and the other of these versions fell quite out of use, Churchmen and Puritans finally agreeing in the decision, not that the old was better, but the new,—so will it be here. What amount of difficulty those who lived in the reign of James the First found in reconciling themselves to the change, it is hard to say. That the old versions had struck deep root in the affections of many is evident from the fact that the Bishops' Bible, if I mistake not, some times, and the Geneva Bible certainly many times, were reprinted, even after they had been formally superseded by the present Version. With the exception of this testimony, we have singularly little on the subject in the cotemporary religious literature, the very absence of such notices seeming to imply that the difficulty was not very great. In one respect it ought to be much smaller now, inasmuch as, careful as King James's Translators were, not to change wantonly, and for mere change's sake, still the alterations which they made were considerable, many times more than would be necessary or desirable now.

And even if it were never thought good that this final step should be taken, that these emendations should be transplanted into the text, if I am mistaken in imagining such an issue one sooner or later not to be averted, what an invaluable help to earnest students of Scripture such a volume might prove! With a little management, its more learned portions might be so separated off in notes as to

leave the substance of it accessible even to the English reader, who might thus be put in possession, though in a somewhat roundabout and less effectual way, of all which a revision would have given him. If, too, he had been shaken by rumours of the inaccuracy of his English Bible, he might here see, on the warrant of those best qualified to judge, how very little way this inaccuracy reached, in what comparatively unessential matters it moved; or if this could not always be asserted, yet this much might, that a revision of his Bible would not draw after it, even in the minutest particular, a revision of his creed. Granting that nothing else should come of it, such a volume might prove an effectual check to wanton and mischievous agitations, to disquieting suggestions that a revised Bible would present God's truth in other lights from those in which it is presented now; and as such the advantage of it might be great.

Nor is it at all impossible that the very unsettlement of men's minds, consequent upon the stirring of this question, might be found to bring with it some compensating gain. This putting to the proof of the words in which God's message had hitherto been conveyed to them, might it not for some be a motive to a more accurate and thoughtful considering of the message itself? It would not, I imagine, be for most of us unprofitable to discover that the words in which the truth has hitherto reached us, are exchangeable for other, in some places, it may be, for better, words. The shock, unpleasant and unwelcome as it would perhaps prove at the first, might yet be a startling of many from a dull, lethargic, unprofitable reading of God's Word; a breaking up of that hard crust of formality which so easily overgrows our study of the Scripture: while in the rousing of the energies of the mind to defend the old, or, before

admitting, thoroughly to test the new, more insight into it might be gained, with more grasp of its deeper meaning, than years of lazy familiarity would have given. For, indeed, according to a profound proverb, "what is ever seen is never seen;" and a daily familiarity with Scripture, full as it is of unutterable blessings, carries, like each other privilege, its dangers with it,—dangers which the course here recommended might contribute much to remove.

Thus much I have thought it desirable to say on this momentous subject. I am not so sanguine as to believe that, with all precautions taken, great and serious, it might be quite unexpected, difficulties would not attend this enterprise. There would need no little wisdom and prudence to bring it to a successful end. Still it might be humbly hoped that by Him who is ever with his Church this prudence and this wisdom would be granted. And, lastly, let me observe that when we make much of the inconveniences which *must* wait upon any such step, we ought never to leave out of sight their transitory character, as contrasted with the permanent character of the gain. How large an amount of inconvenience men have willingly encountered with only some worldly object in view, where they have felt that the inconvenience would be merely temporary, the gain enduring—as in the rectification of the coinage, the readjustment of the calendar. And here too, serious as the inconvenience might be at the first, and during the period of transition, still it would every day be growing slighter: it would be but for a few years at the longest; while the gain, always supposing the work to be well and wisely done, would be for ever; it would be riches and strength for the English Church to the end of time.

APPENDIX.

At a time like the present, when the subject of the Revision of the Authorized Version is occupying so much attention, it might be interesting to some to have before them a tolerably correct list of works bearing on the subject, which have been published in this country or in America, either urging a revision, or dissuading one, or showing by actual example how such might be carried out. The list is as complete as I could make it, and thus includes not merely works of importance, but also some which are of comparatively slight value or of none. I have not considered that entirely new translations belong fitly to this list; but only those which accept our Version as a basis and point of departure, and thus in their agreement with, or dissent from it, may be regarded as offering a running commentary and criticism upon it.

An Essay toward the Amendment of the last English Translation of the Bible, by Robert Gell, D.D. fol. London, 1659.

Errata of the Protestant Bible, by Thomas Ward. 4to. London, 1688.

An Essay for a New Translation of the Bible, by H. R. [Hugh Ross, see Todd's *Life of Bishop Walton*, vol. i. p. 134], a Minister of the Church of England. 1702.

A New and Literal Translation of all the Books of the Old and New Testament, with Notes critical and explanatory, by Anthony Purver. fol. 2 vols. London, 1764.

Prospectus of a New Translation of the Holy Bible, by the Rev. Alexander Geddes. 4to. Glasgow, 1786.

Letter to the Right Rev. the Lord Bishop of London [Bishop Lowth], being an Appendix to a Prospectus of a New Translation, by the same. 4to. London, 1787.

Reasons for revising by Authority our present Version of the Bible. 8vo. Cambridge, 1788.

Observations on the Expediency of revising the present English Version of the Four Gospels and the Acts of the Apostles, by John Symonds, Professor of Modern History in the University of Cambridge. 4to. Cambridge, 1789.

An Historical View of the English Biblical Translations, the Expediency of revising by Authority our present Translation, and the means of executing such a Revision, by William Newcome, Bishop of Waterford. 8vo. Dublin, 1792.

Observations on the Expediency of revising the present English Version of the Epistles, by the same. 4to. Cambridge, 1794.

Letter to the Bishop of Ely on the Subject of a New and Authoritative Translation of the Holy Scriptures, by George Burges. 8vo. Peterborough, 1796.

Remarks upon the Critical Principles adopted by Writers who have at various times recommended a New Translation of the Bible as expedient and necessary, by Archbishop Lawrence. 8vo. Oxford, 1820.

Reasons why a New Translation of the Bible should not be published without a previous Examination of all the material Passages which may be supposed to be misinterpreted. 8vo. Durham, 1816.

Biblical Gleanings, by Thomas Wemyss. 8vo. York, 1816.

Reasons in favour of a New Translation of the Holy Scriptures, by Sir J. B. Burgess. 8vo. London, 1819.

A Vindication of our Authorized Translation of the Bible, by the Rev. Henry John Todd. 8vo. London, 1819.

The Holy Bible in the Common Version, with Amendments of the Language, by Noah Webster. 8vo. New Haven, 1833.

A Supplement to the Authorized English Version of the New Testament, by the Rev. Frederick Henry Scrivener. London, 1845.

Hints for an Improved Translation of the New Testament, by the Rev. James Scholefield. 3d edition. London, 1850.

A Vindication of the Authorized Version of the English Bible, by the Rev. S. C. Malan. London, 1856.

Biblical Revision: Considerations in favour of a Revised Translation of Holy Scripture, by Edward Slater. London, 1856.

The State of the English Bible, by the Rev. W. Harness. London, 1856.

Notes on the proposed Amendment of the Authorized Version of the Holy Scriptures, by William Selwyn, Canon of Ely. 8vo. Cambridge, 1856.

Bible Revision and Translation: an Argument for holding fast what we have, by the Rev. John Cumming. 8vo. London, 1856.

A Plea for the Revisal of the Translation of the Bible of 1611, by F. Iliff. 8vo. Sunderland, 1857.

The Gospel according to St. John, after the Authorized Version, newly compared with the original Greek and revised, by Five Clergymen. 8vo. 2d edition. London, 1857.

The Epistle of St. Paul to the Romans, after the Authorized Version, newly compared with the original Greek and revised, by Five Clergymen. 8vo. London, 1858.

The Epistles of St. Paul to the Corinthians, after the Authorized Version, newly compared with the original Greek and revised, by Five Clergymen. 8vo. London, 1858.

A Revised English Bible the Want of the Church and the Demand of the Age, by John R. Beard, D.D. Small 8vo. London, 1857.

Revision of the Authorized Version of the Bible: an Article in the *Christian Remembrancer*, 1856, pp. 451-499.

The New Testament, revised from the Authorized Version with the aid of other Translations, by Edgar Taylor. Small 8vo. London. No date.

A Plea for an Edition of the Authorized Version of Holy Scripture, with explanatory and emendatory marginal Notes, by the Rev. G. E. Biber. 8vo. London, 1857.

Reasons for holding fast the Authorized English Version of the Bible, by Alexander M'Caul, D.D. London, 1857.

Revision of the Holy Scriptures; an Argument against Objectors, by the Rev. H. Burgess. 8vo. 1857.

The English Bible and our Duty with regard to it, by Philalethes. 8vo. Dublin, 1857.

The Epistle to the Hebrews, translated from the Greek on the Basis of the Common English Version, with Notes. 4to. New York, American Bible Union, 1857.

The Epistle to the Ephesians, translated from the Greek on the Basis of the Common English Version, with Notes. 4to. New York, American Bible Union, 1857.

The Gospel according to Mark, translated from the Greek on the Basis of the Common English Version, with Notes. 4to. New York, American Bible Union, 1858.

The Second Epistle of Peter, the Epistles of John and Judas, and the Revelation, translated from the Greek on the Basis of the Common English Version, with Notes. 4to. London, 1856.

The Epistles of Paul to the Thessalonians, translated from the Greek on the Basis of the Common English Version, with Notes. 4to. London, 1858.

INDEX OF PRINCIPAL TEXTS CONSIDERED.

	PAGE
MATT. v. 15, 16	28
„ v. 21	124
„ vi. 25	88
„ vi. 27	154
„ viii. 20	169
„ ix. 36	124
„ x. 4	170
„ x. 9	144
„ x. 16	125
„ xii. 23	152
„ xiv. 8	171
„ xiv. 13	171
„ xiv. 24	28
„ xvi. 15	62
„ xviii. 33	96
„ xix. 17	204
„ xx. 1, 11	96
„ xx. 23	195
„ xxi. 41	93
„ xxii. 3, 4, 13	103
„ xxiii. 24	172
„ xxiii. 25	47
„ xxviii. 14	113
MARK i. 10	28
„ ii. 18	145
„ iii. 18	170
„ vi. 20	126
„ vii. 4	126
„ xi. 4	173
„ xi. 17	115
„ xii. 26	174
„ xiv. 72	113
„ xvi. 2	146
LUKE i. 19	146
„ i. 59	145
„ ii. 49	155
„ v. 6	145
„ viii. 31	90
„ xi. 17	114
LUKE xi. 48	47
„ xii. 25	154
„ xiii. 2	147
„ xiii. 7	140
„ xiv. 7	145
„ xiv. 72	113
„ xvi. 1	116
„ xvii. 21	126
„ xviii. 12	144
„ xxi. 19	144
„ xxiii. 33	82
„ xxiii. 42	140
JOHN i. 3, 4	121
„ ii. 8, 9	96
„ iii. 10	134
„ iii. 11, 32	95
„ iv. 6	138
„ iv. 29	152
„ v. 16	148
„ v. 18	200
„ viii. 58	151
„ ix. 31	61
„ x. 16	109
„ xii. 6	156
„ xiv. 18	127
„ xvi. 8	127
„ xvii. 12	109
ACTS i. 4	121
„ ii. 47	197
„ iii. 1	145
„ iii. 13, 26	108
„ iv. 27, 30	108
„ vii. 47	75
„ x. 12	149
„ xi. 20	204
„ xii. 4	49
„ xii. 19	121
„ xiii. 18	204
„ xiv. 13	174

PAGE

Acts xvii. 1 134
„ xvii. 18 . . . . . 92, 156
„ xvii. 19 78
„ xvii. 21 29
„ xvii. 22 174
„ xvii. 23 . . . . . 40, 92
„ xix. 37 41
„ xx. 28 205
„ xxi. 3 116
„ xxi. 15 42
„ xxiii. 27 114
„ xxv. 5 175
„ xxvi. 2, 7 137
„ xxvii. 9 114
„ xxvii. 10, 21 95
„ xxviii. 4 143

Rom. i. 26, 27 158
„ ii. 14 136
„ ii. 22 175
„ iii. 25 106
„ iv. 1-24 90
„ v. 15, 17 135
„ viii. 21 81
„ xi. 2 174
„ xi. 8 176
„ xii. 11 204
„ xv. 4 95

1 Cor. iii. 17 93
„ iv. 4 43
„ xi. 27 192
„ xiii. 12 158

2 Cor. ii. 14 160
„ ii. 17 161
„ iii. 5, 6 94
„ v. 10 148
„ xi. 3 141

Gal. i. 6 141
„ i. 18 177
„ ii. 6, 9 185
„ iii. 22 94
„ v. 6 192
„ v. 19, 20 177

Ephes. iii. 14, 15 26
„ iv. 3 43

PAGE

Ephes. iv. 18 117
„ iv. 29 178

Phil. ii. 3 63
„ ii. 13 94
„ ii. 15 148
„ iii. 5 138
„ iv. 3 179

Col. i. 13 81
„ i. 15 180
„ i. 16 147
„ ii. 8 163
„ ii. 18 128
„ ii. 23 164
„ iv. 13 204

1 Thess. iv. 6 129
„ v. 22 117

2 Thess. ii. 3 122
„ ii. 6 93

1 Tim. iii. 16 205
„ iv. 1, 2, 3 182
„ v. 4 44
„ v. 13 122
„ vi. 2 134
„ vi. 5 118
„ vi. 8 165
„ vi. 9 47
„ vi. 10 137

Tit. ii. 13 201

Heb. ii. 16 165
„ iv. 1 121
„ iv. 8 75
„ v. 2 130
„ v. 8 61
„ v. 11 150
„ vi. 7 139
„ ix. 5 62
„ ix. 23 118
„ x. 34 196
„ x. 38 198
„ xi. 10 133
„ xi. 13 119
„ xi. 29 183

	PAGE
HEB. xii. 23	153
„ xiii. 4	191
„ xiii. 9	204
JAM. i. 4, 5	95
„ i. 13	115
„ i. 26	184
„ ii. 2, 3	96
„ iii. 5	167
„ v. 9	48
1 PET. i. 17	120
„ ii. 4, 5	45
„ iii. 18	185
„ iv. 9	48
2 PET. i. 5-7	142
„ i. 14	146
2 PET. iii. 12	130
„ iii. 16	29
1 JOHN v. 15	61
JUDE 12	186
REV. i. 18	21
„ iii. 2	167
„ iv. 4	91
„ iv. 5	143
„ iv. 6-9	103
„ vii. 14	133
„ xv. 2	138
„ xv. 3	204
„ xvi. 2	47
„ xxi. 12	63
„ xxi. 19, 20	80

INDEX OF GREEK WORDS.

Ἄβυσσος	90
ἄγγελος	23
ᾅδης	21
ἀκέραιος	123
ἀλλοτριοεπίσκοπος	25
ἄμφοδος	173
ἀπάγω	121
ἀπείθεια	105
ἀπιστία	105
ἀποκαραδοκία	121
ἄρειος πάγος	78
ἀσσάριον	71
αὐλή	109
βαστάζω	156
βάτος	174
γέεννα	21
γίνομαι	150
γραμματεύς	70
δεισιδαίμων	175
δελεάζω	184
διά	139
διάκονος	103
δϊυλίζω	172
δϊχοστασία	177
δοκέω	184
δολόω	162
δοῦλος	103
δυνατός	175
εἶδος	117
εἰς	140
ἐλέγχω	127
ἐν	140
ἐνεργέομαι	192
ἐπί	138
ἐπιγινώσκω, ἐπίγνωσις	27
ἐπιλαμβάνομαι	166
Ἑρμῆς	71
ἐῤῥιμμένος	124
ἔσοπτρον	158
ἑτερόφθαλμος	20
εὐκαιρέω	29
εὐπερίστατος	25

	PAGE
ζῶον	103
ἡλικία	154
θηρίον	103
θριαμβεύω	160
θρόνος	91
ἱεροσυλέω	176
ἱστορέω	177
Καναν[ί]της	170
καπηλεύω	161
καταβραβεύω	128
κατάνυξις	176
καταπίνω	183
καταργέω	160
κατασκήνωσις	169
κάτοπτρον	158
κλίνη	126
κοδράντης	71
κόφινος	107
κτάομαι	144
κύριος	29
λόγος	16
λογίζομαι	90
μάγος	23
μετάνοια	17
μετριοπαθέω	130
μονόφθαλμος	20
νεωκόρος	70
ὁμοιοπαθής	174
ὀρφανός	127
παῖς Θεοῦ	108
παράκλητος	23
πάρεσις	106
πεζῇ	171
ποίμνη	109
προβιβάζω	171
πρωτοτόκος	180
πώρωσις	116
σάρδιος, σάρδινος	79
σέβασμα	41
σκέπασμα	165
σοφός	105
σπερμολόγος	156
σπυρίς	107
συλαγωγέω	163
συντηρέω	126
τηρέω	109
ὕλη	167
ὑπόδειγμα	119
φαίνομαι	148, 184
φλύαρος	122
φθινοπωρινός	186
φρόνιμος	105
φυλάσσω	109

INDEX OF OTHER WORDS.

Allow	46
Alms	60
Apollo, Apollos	77
Babbler	157
Beast	103
Bribery	47
By	43
By and bye	48
Calvary	82
Canaanite	170
Candy	122
Carriage	42
Cherubims	63
Chrysolite	79
Chrysoprasus	79
Church	41
Comforter	24

	PAGE
Convince	127
Cretes, Cretians	78
Cumber	40
DEPART	46
Devotion	41
EACH	63
Easter	49
Elias, Elijah	74
Endeavour	43
Every	63
FLIX	66
Fourmiller	25
GOODMAN OF THE HOUSE	96
Grudge	48
IDOL	193
Image	193
Its	58
JESUS	75
Jewry	49
Joshua	75
KINRED	66
LIVELY	45
MERCURIUS	71
Miletum	78
Moe, more	66
NAZARENE	122
Nazarite	122
Nephew	44
Noisome	47
OFTEN	60
PARACLETE	23
Pattern	119
Pavaner, pavonear	25
Pergamos	78
Pœnitentia	17
Primesautier	26
REFLEXION	53
Religious	175
Reprove	127
Resipiscentia	17
Riches	60
SARDINE STONE	80
Sardius	79
Sedition	177
Sermo	17
Shamefastness	66
Slave	104
THOUGHT	38
Three Taverns	80
Timotheus, Timothy	77
Trifler	122
Trouble	111
URBANE	76
VERBUM	17
WHICH	65
Wizard	23

THE END.

LONDON:
PRINTED BY LEVEY, ROBSON, AND FRANKLYN,
Great New Street and Fetter Lane.

Digitized with financial assistance from the
Government of Maharashtra
on 02 July, 2018